



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1995

No. 154

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We hear the discordant voices of our land and of our world and we can become perplexed and we wonder if there is any harmony or unity that binds people together. Yet, O gracious God, we know that You have created all people in Your image and are the ruler over all time and space. As we hear the differing voices and the varying clamor and clatter from so many places, remind us that every person from every land from every tradition can speak Your truth, the truth that can set all people free. Bless us, O gracious God, this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 1, rule I, the Chair will postpone the vote until later in the day.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SKAGGS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

TRIBUTE TO MARCIA SMITH

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and commendation to an exceptional public servant and a member of the congressional staff. After nearly exactly 10 years on my staff, my scheduler and personal secretary, Marcia Smith, will be leaving today. She has been prototypically an exceptional congressional employee, and I wanted to bring that fact to the attention of the House. Her performance here, her skill, the way she has met people from across the world who have come through my office, has been absolutely an outstanding reflection upon this institution, on this Member, and on my constituents in Nebraska.

I thank her for her tremendous service in what is undoubtedly one of the most hectic jobs for all of us, the scheduler-secretary. Her performance here has been exceptional, and I will miss her greatly in my work and life. We wish her well and great success and joy in her new career and life in Chicago. Good luck to you, Marcia.

CHANGE BURDEN OF PROOF IN TAX CASES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. "With liberty and justice for all." All except taxpayers. The Internal Revenue Service and scorekeeper said if Congress changes the burden of proof in a tax case to treat a taxpayer under the Bill of Rights like any other citizen, innocent until proven guilty, it would cost the Government too much. So as a result, it is not going to happen again.

Let me say this to Members of the Congress: If the Congress themselves scored the Constitution, we would repeal for money purposes the Bill of Rights.

Shame, Congress. Hide your face. It is time to change the burden of proof in a tax case. This Congress must address that issue, or the American people should get in our face.

SAVING MEDICARE

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, Republicans in the House this week celebrated the 1-year anniversary of the Contract With America. That contract was and is a promise to the American people to reform the way things are done around here and we delivered. Now we are making a promise to preserve and strengthen Medicare. We intend to deliver again.

The shameless demagoguery that our liberal Democrat colleagues are engaging in will not stop us. The false TV ads put out by special interest groups will not stop us. The deliberate deception of the American people by a liberal minority with no solutions of its own will not stop us. We will deliver.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H9673

Mr. Speaker, for too long our Nation was plagued by a liberal majority party that was satisfied with sacrificing the future of our children to sustain its power. Our new majority has already begun to change the priorities of Congress. The Republicans will not let this generation or our future generations down. We promise to save Medicare. We will deliver.

REPRESSING POLITICAL EXPRESSION IN AMERICA

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Madam Speaker, the effort by the proponents of the so-called McIntosh amendment to abuse and repress political expression in this country keeps on causing abuses of its own. First, abusing the regular legislative process and sticking this ill-advised bill into an appropriations measure. Then abusing committee authority by subjecting witnesses at yesterday's hearing to an inquisition about their protected first amendment activities. And now an abuse of decency and truth, putting out a sleazy forgery concocted by Committee on Government Reform and Oversight staff to deceive and mislead.

Yesterday, at the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight hearing on this crazy measure, this document, forged by committee staff to look like the stationery of an organization called as a witness, but containing false and misleading information, was put out. How low will the backers of this awful idea stoop to achieve their illicit purposes?

To add insult to this injury, the chairman has the temerity to claim this forgery was not intended to deceive. Madam Speaker, forgeries, by definition, are intended to deceive.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION NEEDED TO SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, Democrats claim that the Republican majority is trying to ram through Medicare reform. This is not true. Since April, this Congress has conducted 36 hearings on saving Medicare, and our Members have met with thousands of constituents at hundreds of town meetings across the country. The Washington Post says there is a legitimate debate to be had about what ought to be the future of Medicare. But that is not what the Democrats are engaged in. They are engaged in demagoguery and class warfare, and it is wrong.

I challenge the Democrats to come up with an alternative plan and be part of the solution. Madam Speaker, it is time for the Democrats to take their head out of the sand and dispel the be-

lief that the new Democratic Party image is the ostrich.

SUPPORT INTEGRATING GUAM AND NORTHERN MARIANAS INTO NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN

(Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in a letter to the Federal Communications Commission in support of integrating Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands into the North American numbering plan and the domestic rate system.

A Canadian telecommunications company has objected to the Guam request. The Canadians noted the significant possibility that due to their proximity to Asia, these islands could become telecommunications gateways to billions of potential Asian customers. In other words, the Canadians stand to lose business if the American Pacific territories are integrated into the domestic rate plan.

What are the Canadians afraid of? Believe it or not, they are afraid of competition from American carriers on Guam. Since most of the telecommunications traffic from Asia is currently routed through Vancouver, removing this FCC regulation would mean that American carriers operating on Guam could compete in the Asian market. It's a win for American companies and for the American economy and for competition.

You would think that the way Canada is reacting to this that Guam is challenging the Canadians for the Stanley Cup.

I ask my colleagues to join me in cosigning a letter to the FCC in support of the petition to remove this regulation and in support of increasing American competitiveness in Asia.

STOP SCARING MEDICARE RECIPIENTS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, Medicare is going broke by 2002, according to the President's board of trustees. If there is no balanced budget, if the budget was already balanced, and if no reduction in taxes were going to occur, Medicare is still going broke by 2002, according to the President's board of trustees.

Last night I spoke with my mother, Marcy Tiaht, who this month, September 17, turned 68. My father is 76. I want them to have the best, especially when it comes to Medicare. And after talking to them, I realized that some of the liberal opponents to Medicare were trying to scare them.

I wondered, now, who would want to scare my parents and your parents and your grandparents? Would it be a spoiled child, or a mean-spirited person, or someone with very, very selfish interests? I do not know. But I do know that there is no shame on the floor of the House, and there is no credibility to those who would scare my parents and your parents and your grandparents to serve their selfish motives.

A STEP BACKWARD IN MEDICAL CARE

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Madam Speaker, today in Washington with me is a constituent of mine, Frank DiPalo, Jr. Frank DiPalo will be testifying later this afternoon about the impact of the cuts on Medicare and Medicaid.

Frank remembers the days when his parents could not retire because they could not afford to. Frank DiPalo remembers the days when senior citizens were drugged in nursing homes because they did not have adequate staff to maintain those nursing homes. What the Republicans are calling for is lifting the standards in these nursing homes that keep them home with dignity.

Frank is going to speak out about what it is like for senior citizens with regard to out-of-pocket expenses for pharmaceutical drugs and the like, and Frank is going to say it is unjust for the Republicans to give a \$245 billion tax cut, over 52 percent of which is going to go to families earning \$100,000 or more, all while 85 percent of Medicare recipients get less than \$25,000 and spend more than a quarter of that income on their health care expenses.

LIMITING GOVERNMENT AND LOWERING TAXES

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman just spoke, if Frank depends on the Democrats and the liberals for the next 7 years, he will return to those days of yesteryear.

Madam Speaker, Republicans are not backing down from our commitment to balance the budget, cut taxes, save Medicare, and reform welfare. Unlike our liberal friends across the aisle, we will not abandon Medicare to bankruptcy. We are going to make Medicare better and provide more choices. We will also provide tax relief for working families. Taxes are just too high and families need the extra money and to determine how they will spend their own money.

I, for one, will not apologize for advocating tax cuts. Besides, the President and his liberal friends, against the will

of the American people, gave them the highest tax increase in the history of the world with the promise they would balance the budget in 5 years. But if you give a liberal a dollar, they will spend five. They did not keep their promise, so let us give the money back.

Madam Speaker, this debate over Medicare really boils down to two assumptions about government: Liberal Democrats believe a big spending, high tax government is good. Republicans do not.

AMERICAN PEOPLE CONCERNED ABOUT MEDICARE

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I am amazed that the other side stands up and says shame, shame, shame on this side. Now, let me tell you: That side has been waving around the trustees report saying we must cut Medicare, we must cut Medicare. We have been dealing with the trustees report every year. So they go out and they slash Medicare, and they will not let the trustees even see their plan nor come and testify on their plan, because they know the trustees said you only had to cut \$9 billion, and they cut \$270 billion.

Oh, what is happening with the change there? That is a chunk of change, and we think they are going to pocket it.

Thank goodness the American people are not asleep. Let me read a letter I got today from a Coloradan. "Today's Republican single-day hearing on Medicaid was one of the most shameful displays of naked arrogant power I have ever witnessed." It goes on to say, "Enough."

If they want to do that, they can at least let the trustees see if they have the right plan. And we know what they are going to say: They are giving a tax cut.

□ 1015

CHANTS OF TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY USED AS DIVERSION- ARY TACTIC ON MEDICARE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, Democrats have accused Republicans of giving tax breaks to the rich. This is a blatant diversionary tactic. The Democrats have no plan to save Medicare. Rather than working to protect Medicare from bankruptcy, they would rather sling mud.

The Republican tax proposals have nothing to do with Medicare. Our cuts in discretionary spending alone will save \$151 billion. Savings in welfare and other mandatory spending programs will save \$171 billion. So just in

these two areas we save \$322 billion, far more than our tax cuts.

Democrats have got to realize that in most areas of government life it is time to tighten our belts. The American people mandated these changes in 1994. Now, it is up to us to see our promises will be kept. It is time to protect Medicare and assure beneficiaries that the program as they know it will continue to be available. It is not the time to scare our parents and grandparents into believing class warfare distortions.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN VISIONARY JAMES W. ROUSE

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in a tribute to an American visionary and native Marylander, James W. Rouse. Today James Rouse is receiving our Nation's highest civilian award, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Mr. Rouse is best known as the creator of shopping malls and Columbia, MD, the largest planned city in America. However, in addition, James Rouse has devoted his life to implementing a vision that has transformed and improved the lives of millions of Americans.

Madam Speaker, many say that with developments such as the Inner Harbor in Baltimore, James Rouse is singularly responsible for saving American cities. His nonprofit Enterprise Foundation formed in 1981 helps low-income neighborhood groups in cities across America rebuild their housing.

Mr. Rouse's words should inspire us all. "A full life is not achieved through one's material well-being, but by dealing with the whole of life wherever one is. Circumstances have placed me in the life of the city. I see so many things that ought to be better."

Congratulations, Mr. Rouse.

REPUBLICANS ASSAULT ON WORKING FAMILIES

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express grave concern over the Republican assault on working families through their harmful Medicare and Medicaid proposals. Consider the way in which the Republican Medicaid legislation, which passed the Committee on Commerce, leaves the elderly and their families unprotected.

Madam Speaker, elderly people with incomes of less than \$625 per month would lose their guarantee to assistance in paying their monthly Medicare premiums. Five million women in America depend on Medicaid to pay their Medicare premiums each month.

In addition to this, there is the problem of nursing home care. In addition to lifting standards for nursing homes, there would be no more guarantee of coverage for nursing homes, there would be no more guarantee of coverage for nursing home care after an individual or family has spent all of its savings. There would be no more guarantee that spouses of nursing home residents would be able to retain enough monthly income to remain in the community.

Madam Speaker, States would be allowed to place liens on the homes, family homes and family farms. States would be allowed to require the adult children of nursing home residents to pay for their parents' nursing home care, about \$40,000 a year. And all of this in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans.

DEMOCRATS PLANNING AN OCTOBER 5 TOUR AROUND THE COUNTRY

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, America should get ready. The Democrats are coming, and the date is October 5. This is their blueprint for coming into more than 50 districts around the country, not to talk about how to save Medicare, but to criticize Republicans.

We have a plan, Madam Speaker. We want to save, protect, and strengthen Medicare, but this is their blueprint. If America wants to know when they are going to be in your area, please call my office. It is October 5. They have no plan. All they want to do is come to these districts and scare Americans and scare senior citizens.

If America wants to know the truth, if they want solutions, if they want to know how we are going to strengthen and protect and save Medicare for our seniors, they should call my office and we will be happy to give them the details. This is the blueprint. They are coming October 5, so get ready.

DEMOCRATS NOT INCLUDED IN REFORMING MEDICARE OR MEDICAID

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Madam Speaker, I got a hoot out of hearing my colleagues talking about the Democrats having no plan. It is like a baseball game and it gets to be the bottom of the ninth inning, and they turn to our team and say, hey, do you want to go to bat? They have not included us in any of the plans, they have not included us in anything, and now they want to know if we can to join with them in the bottom of the ninth inning.

I got a great hoot today out of one of my colleagues talking about the Contract With America. The first Contract With America was the Constitution. It guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then in 1935 we made another contract with Americans. We said if Americans work hard and pay into Social Security, they will have a safety net. Then in 1965, when one-third of our seniors were living in poverty, we said we will make another contract with America, we will create Medicare and Medicaid.

Now, the Republicans, for the first time in 40 years, have control of the House, and they want to undo those safety nets. They want to say to these people we are going to save Medicare by bleeding \$270 billion out of it. We are going to save Medicaid by bleeding \$182 billion out of it. This is the same kind of medical care they used to give George Washington with leeches. I say this is the actually the biggest highway robbery since the James Gang rode the west. They should be ashamed.

SAVE MEDICARE FROM BANKRUPTCY

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Madam Speaker, here is a picture of the new symbol of the liberal Democrat Party. Yes, it is an ostrich with its head in the sand.

This symbolizes the Democrats response to saving Medicare from bankruptcy. When told back in April by their own Medicare trustees in the Clinton administration that Medicare would go bottom up in 7 years, Democrats buried their heads in the sand.

Madam Speaker, it really is a shame that the party that devised Medicare in the 1960's would abandon it in the 1990's. Democrats have not put forward one idea on how to preserve Medicare, not one. Where is their plan? This is irresponsible and, in the words of the Washington Post, "wrong."

Yesterday, former Democrat Congressman Tim Penny wrote that Democrats should be in the forefront of saving Medicare from bankruptcy. Instead, like this ostrich, they have buried their heads in the sand.

DO NOT CUT MEDICARE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the Republican plan to cut \$270 billion from Medicare in order to fund a tax cut for the wealthy is beginning to make members of their own party squeamish.

This week, three Republican members of the other body said they could not stand by a \$245 billion tax cut while cutting \$270 billion from Medi-

care. They think it is the wrong thing to do and they are right.

The Republican proposals to cut Medicare will mean that seniors will see their premiums double and their deductibles double. Senior citizens living on fixed incomes simply cannot afford to see their premiums go from \$45 a month to \$93 a month, or see their deductibles go from \$100 to \$200.

The three Republican Senators are right. It is wrong to ask 37 million American seniors to pay \$1,000 more for Medicare, so that the wealthiest Americans can get a \$20,000 tax cut.

SENIOR CITIZENS SHOULD HAVE RIGHT TO CHOOSE THEIR HEALTH PLAN

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, did you see this? We just heard more of this.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that amazes me about this debate is that one of the options that individuals have, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be pleased to know this, is if a senior citizen chooses, chooses to stay in a 35-year-old plan, they may do that. If they choose to do that, they have that option. They have the option to do that if they want. They will have other choices that will give them far more flexibility, far more choice, et cetera, et cetera.

What is important about this is that in fact what we do know is that one of the choices that will exist is if a senior citizen wants to stay in the program exactly the way that it is today, they may do that. They may do that, but they will also be given other choices, better choices, newer choices.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD BE LEADERS, NOT OBSTRUCTIONISTS, DURING REFORM OF MEDICARE

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I do not expect the people on that side of the aisle necessarily to listen to us, but I would hope they would listen to one of their former colleagues and a Democrat who wrote the other day in the Washington Post. And, incidentally, he was my immediate predecessor, Tim Penny, who wrote a column entitled "Medicare Mistake."

In the column he says, "By politicizing the issue, Democrats threaten the viability of the very program they created." He goes on to say, "Democrats in Congress have not only opposed Republican reform initiatives, they have also refused to embrace the savings identified in President Clinton's plan. We cannot afford to ignore Medicare's shaky financial condition or put it off until after the next election. It is just too important. The Medicare trustees

have given us a 7-year warning. These 7 years should not be squandered in indecision, stall tactics and politicking. We should view this time as an opportunity to devise and employ creative solutions. Democrats should be the leaders in this debate, not the obstructionists."

□ 1030

APPOINT AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL AND BRING INVESTIGATION OF SPEAKER TO A CONCLUSION

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, the lyrics to an old song say, "First you say you will, then you say you won't. You're undecided now, what are you going to do?"

This apparently has become the theme song for the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. One minute she says she is going to have an outside counsel, then she is not going to have an outside counsel.

She said in 1988, the House should have an outside counsel when the committee investigated Speaker Wright, and now she is saying maybe she did not mean to sign that letter or agree with it at all. What is it?

The fact is that the only way this inquiry of Speaker GINGRICH can be brought to a conclusion is with an outside counsel. The press tells us, the Manchester Journal and Inquirer tells us, that when the chairman of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct visited with the Speaker to inform him that in all likelihood there would be an outside counsel, he hit the roof and said, "You are going to wreck the GOP revolution and you are going to bring me down."

Well, as he said to Speaker Wright, if you are innocent, you have nothing to fear from the outside counsel. Let us maintain the standard that the House has had since 1979 and appoint an outside counsel and let us get this investigation to a conclusion.

JUANITA MORGAN'S DEPARTURE FROM THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, as vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I rise today to thank and wish the best of luck to Juanita Morgan, or Nita, as all her friends call her.

I have had the great pleasure of working with Nita, who after 16 years of loyal and dedicated service, is leaving the Joint Economic Committee to join the private sector.

During her tenure with the committee, Nita has worked in a variety of

professional and administrative roles including planning hearings, producing studies, and generally making the trains run on time.

Nita has worked with a number of JEC members including our distinguished majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, Senator ROTH, Congressman "BUD" BROWN, and many others.

Over the years Nita has impressed all of us with her dedication, creativity, and professionalism.

Nita has worked on the most successful JEC projects from the formation of what would become the Reagan Economic Revolution to the New Republican Renaissance.

Nita Morgan will be sorely missed. But we do wish her nothing but the best in her new position with the Business Leadership Council.

Nita, good luck and godspeed.

TIME TO APPOINT OUTSIDE COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to once again appoint an outside counsel, for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has not followed the process as described here in the Rules of Official Conduct.

These rules state that after receiving a complaint, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct then determines whether the complaint, here against the Speaker, merits further inquiry and then it issues a preliminary inquiry. That is found in rule XV.

If so, then a subcommittee is appointed to investigate, under rule XVII, whether there is reason to believe a violation has occurred. Then the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducts a trial-like hearing.

Unfortunately, the resolution for a preliminary inquiry has never been filed. But the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, according to its chairperson, has begun a process that is "flexible" and "a process that its own committee Members can feel good about."

Madam Speaker, ethics should not be flexible because the subject of the investigation is the Speaker. I want all Members and the American people to feel good about this investigation and to restore the faith and confidence in this institution.

Please appoint an outside independent counsel.

TIME TO CUT SUGAR SUBSIDIES

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, one thing maybe we can agree on, on a bi-

partisan basis, is the sugar program. In a Congress where we are revising and cutting and reducing welfare, education, farm programs right and left. We are restructuring Medicare and the School Lunch Program. We are going after all commodities: Peanuts, cotton, wheat, the Market Promotion Program. The list is endless.

But, Madam Speaker, what stands alone as the sweetest deal of all? Sugar. And the result: The world price of sugar is 11 cents per ton; the domestic price is 24 cents a ton.

But does it really cost the taxpayers? Not directly, because they have got the USDA in on the thing. Who pays the difference though? Shoppers at the grocery stores, and it costs American consumers \$1.4 billion.

Who is getting rich on it? Plenty of sugar farmers out there. There are 33 farmers involved in the sugar program in Florida alone that receive over a billion dollars in payments. One gets about \$65 million a year.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] have a bill to eliminate the sugar program, and I believe, Madam Speaker, we should bring this debate to the floor of the House for a yes-or-no vote.

FULL INQUIRY INTO ETHICS COMPLAINTS IS MERITED

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WARD. Madam Speaker, I want to share some newspaper quotations from the Hartford Courant, the newspaper in Hartford, CT. In an article in Wednesday's edition, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct chairman, NANCY JOHNSON, was asked why she was treating ethics cases this year differently than she, in a 1988 letter, said such cases should be treated.

In 1988, Chairman JOHNSON insisted that the committee conduct a full inquiry into every complaint against then Speaker Jim Wright. Mrs. JOHNSON's explanation in the article is that, and I quote from the article, "This is Newt speaking." In 1988, she said that.

Yes, the very man today who is of a different opinion now than he was then; than he and Committee on Standards of Official Conduct Chair JOHNSON were then.

Madam Speaker, if in 1988 we should have had a full, no-subject-areas-ignored-and-avoided inquiry, then we should today. We should do it the same today as they insisted we do it in 1988.

DEMOCRATS REMAIN COMMITTED TO LEVELING IMPULSE

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, since the mid-1800's, Western intellectuals

have been consumed by what is known as the leveling impulse. The leveling impulse is the idea that Government can create a more just society by redistributing wealth. Today, the modern Democrat Party is grounded in the leveling impulse. To Democrats, any talk of a tax decrease is absolutely sinful.

This is why they rail at any attempt by this Republican Congress to give working American families a \$500-per-child tax credit. That is why they scream when reduced capital gains are mentioned. And that is why they fight to preserve every silly Government spending project ever devised.

Madam Speaker, Democrats claim we are raiding Medicare to give tax breaks for the rich. This is beyond ludicrous. Our tax cuts are more than offset by shrinking the bureaucratic government. The real problem here is that Democrats are still convinced that all money belongs to them and that government is a miracle worker.

INDEPENDENT COUNSEL NOW FOR COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, with September drawing to a close, troubling ethical questions concerning the process of ethics in this House linger on.

As a recent supreme court justice, I am concerned about the rule of law, about ethical standards, about the precedents of this House. The precedent of this House is that in every significant case since 1979, before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, an independent counsel has been proposed and has been implemented.

The words of the gentlewoman who heads that Committee on Standards of Official Conduct today are that she thinks that naming an outside counsel could get in the way of the committee. And she says, and these are really her words this week, "The letter of the law is not compelling to me. My goal is to have a process that the committee members feel good about."

We do not need to feel good. We need the letter of the law. We need the rule of law.

There is another precedent. It's called the Packwood precedent. Delay, delay, delay, until the people of this country demand action. That is what they need to do about Speaker GINGRICH.

AMERICA MUST REJECT REPUBLICAN MEDICARE PLAN

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, after only 1 day of hearings, the Republicans have finally released their plan

to kill Medicare. The American people know exactly what the Republicans are doing.

The Republican plan is to cut \$270 billion out of Medicare to pay for a tax cut for the rich. Because of this, seniors' premiums will be increased, seniors will be put out of nursing homes, medical services will decrease, drug costs will increase. Finally, Madam Speaker, under the Republican plan, the elderly will die prematurely.

America must reject this cold, this cruel, and this heartless Republican plan to kill Medicare.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON S. 440, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on the Senate bill (S. 440) to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes.

As additional conferees for the consideration of sections 105 and 141 of the Senate bill, and section 320 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BLILEY, BILIRAKIS, BARTON of Texas, GREENWOOD, DINGELL, WAXMAN, and BROWN of Ohio.

As additional conferees for the consideration of section 157 of the Senate bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, HANSEN, and MILLER of California.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1977), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 21, 1995, at page H9431.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with somewhat mixed emotions. I had hoped to bring my first Interior appropriations conference agreement, as chairman, to the floor with unqualified support. Unfortunately, there are some divisions among conferees as you will note from the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the essence of democracy is compromise. In my 9 months as chairman I have learned that our form of government is truly a democracy, and I would not change that. Despite that fact, I, like many of our conferees, am not happy with every provision in the bill. However, the conference agreement before you today is an excellent example of how we on the Committee on Appropriations have taken our pledge to balance the budget very seriously.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before you today charts a new course, a fiscally responsible course, but a course which also provides for the protection and enhancement of our public lands, preserves the critical science and research capabilities, and maintains health and education programs for native Americans and, I would add, very important, respects private property rights.

While I believe this bill is fiscally very responsible and represents common sense, the action of the conferees with respect to mining is in direct opposition to the views of a bipartisan majority of this body, as was evident by the vote on the Klug amendment. I understand there will probably be a motion to recommit and each Member will have to make his or her own decision on the mining policy issue.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is 10 percent, or \$1.4 billion below 1995 spending levels. This represents real savings, both now and in the future. By not starting new programs or construction, we save costs in future years. The bill terminates agencies and programs and puts others on notice that Federal funding will terminate in the near future. This bill is not business as usual.

We are not cutting at the margins with the hopes that we can keep programs on life support until more money becomes available in the future. Instead, we have terminated lower priority initiatives to provide scarce resources to meet the many critical needs of our public lands, to ensure quality health and education for native Americans and to promote quality science and research in energy and public land management.

Specifically, four agencies are eliminated: the National Biological Service; Bureau of Mines; DOE's Office of Emergency Preparedness; and Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation. In addition, more than 35 individual programs have been eliminated.

With respect to the National Biological Service, an issue of some interest to many in this body, let me reiterate that the NBS has been eliminated. However, as many agreed, the core nat-

ural resource research activities, critical to responsible stewardship of our public lands, has been preserved and will be carried out by what is widely recognized as the premier unbiased, credible, specific agency, the U.S. Geological Survey.

This will ensure that critical research, critical scientific information will continue, and that it will be conducted independent of regulatory influence or agendas and will ensure scientific excellence.

In keeping with our commitment to reduce spending, we have also cut funding for this activity by 15 percent.

□ 1045

As to the endangered species program, we are waiting on the authorizing committee inasmuch as the authorization for the Endangered Species Act has expired and we hope that the Committee on Resources will bring out a bill. The appropriation recognizes that we are waiting for that action.

The National Endowment for the Arts is funded at the House-passed level of \$99.5 million. The statement of the managers also makes it clear that it is the intent of the House to terminate Federal support for the NEA after fiscal year 1997. Again, this is consistent with the authorizing bill that has come out of the committee of jurisdiction.

Funding for land acquisition, as in the House-passed bill, is not earmarked and is funded at 40 percent below last year's funding levels. This ensures that the limited funding will be directed only to high priority projects for the four land management agencies. If there is a critical piece of land, there will be funding available, but we do no earmarking.

Contrary to what Members may have read in their local press, passage of this bill will not force the closure of one single national park or recreation area. No park will be forced to close under this agreement, as funding for park operations is over 1995 levels by \$5 million. I would point out that this is in the face of a 10-percent reduction overall. We have kept the funding for those agencies, those facilities where the public interfaces at pretty much 1995 levels in terms of operations. In the case of the parks, it is \$5 million over 1995. There certainly is not reason whatsoever to close any park.

To achieve that, increased savings were made in lower priority park programs such as land acquisition and construction. Those things are nice to do, but we did not have the funding to achieve that. Initially, I tried to divide the responsibilities into three categories, must-do's, need-to-do's and nice-to-do's. Some of these are nice to do, but we had to take care of the must-do's.

Construction has been reduced by more than 14 percent, and land acquisition is down nearly 44 percent. Overall—and that is including every dimension of the park activity—funding is

down less than 5 percent. With respect to construction, we have funded critical maintenance, health and safety, and repair and rehabilitation rather than starting new projects.

In effect, let us take care of what we have. This is very important. All of you who are homeowners recognize that you have to take care of the repairs and rehabilitation of a structure or the result of much more expensive problems late on. We have taken that approach in dealing with our responsibility in terms of construction.

Funding for critical scientific research is also maintained, including important health and safety research and mineral assessments of the former Bureau of Mines, which will now be carried out by the USGS and the Department of Energy for significant savings. This disposition upholds the House position that much of the work of the Bureau in health and safety research and minerals information is critical and these functions will be preserved.

I might also add that in terms of the energy funding, we respect the contractual obligations of the U.S. Government. We have many projects that are underway and research through contracts with universities, almost all of them matching funds. Nevertheless we ensure that these contracts can be carried out and that the word of the U.S. Government will be maintained.

Core programs that are critical to providing for the needs of native Americans have also been maintained. Funding for the Indian Health Service is down less than 1 percent from last year's level. I might add that many native Americans came to see me in the past 3 weeks, and without exception they said the most important thing to them is the tribal priority allocations [TPA]. We recognize their concerns, and for that reason we directed the \$87 million increase over the Senate to TPA.

Energy programs have also been reduced 10 percent from 1995 levels with commitments for continued downward trends. Numerous energy projects were terminated and the limited funding focused on projects and programs which leveraged significant non-Federal investment. While new construction was significantly curtailed, it was our goal to take care of necessary maintenance and rehabilitation of Federal facilities, and a good example is the Smithsonian, where the conference report provides nearly \$34 million, which is the President's budget request, for critical repair and restoration of aging Smithsonian facilities.

As Members may recall, when the Interior bill was on the House floor in July, the House voted 271 to 153 to support maintaining the existing moratorium on the issuance of mineral pat-

ents on public lands. However, the Senate prevailed in the conference, and that moratorium is not presently in the conference report.

I reiterate, in terms of the budget, this is a good bill and with respect to the stewardship of our public lands and resources, I also believe it is a good bill. In the long term we cannot truly be good stewards of our public lands and our cultural and natural resources, we cannot foster scientific excellence, we cannot ensure a better future for native Americans, we cannot improve our energy security, if we cannot first get our fiscal house in order.

I think it is imperative for future generations, if they are to have the same rich heritage that we have, that we have control of our fiscal house, that we not spend their future.

Page 53 in the statement of the managers which accompanies the conference report—House Report 104-259—contains a typographical error under amendment No. 110 which deals with the fossil energy research and development appropriation for the Department of Energy. The general reduction to processing research and downstream operations in the oil technology program is \$1,100,000.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD at this point a table on the various amounts in the bill as agreed to by the conference managers.

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	597,236,000	616,547,000	570,017,000	563,936,000	566,082,000	-26,174,000
Fire protection	114,748,000	114,763,000				-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	121,176,000	131,482,000				-121,176,000
Wildland fire management			236,924,000	240,159,000	236,924,000	+236,924,000
Central hazmat account	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access	12,088,000	3,019,000	2,815,000	2,815,000	3,115,000	-8,953,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	101,409,000	113,911,000	111,409,000	100,000,000	101,500,000	+91,000
Land acquisition	14,757,000	24,473,000	8,500,000	10,550,000	12,800,000	-1,857,000
Oregon and California grant lands	97,364,000	112,752,000	91,367,000	96,364,000	93,379,000	-3,985,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,006,000	1,158,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,150,000	501,478,000	497,943,000	-13,391,000
Construction	53,768,000	34,095,000	28,366,000	36,775,000	37,666,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	6,687,000	6,700,000	6,018,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,667,000
Land acquisition	67,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,983,000	38,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-898,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,196,000
Rewards and operations	1,167,000	1,169,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	-967,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	8,983,000	12,000,000	4,500,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund		152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund		400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	998,000	1,000,000	998,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	568,938,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,985,000		-162,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,068,249,000	1,082,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	38,094,000	37,849,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	38,312,000	36,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,688,000	179,883,000	114,868,000	116,480,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
Urban park and recreation fund	8,000	2,300,000				-8,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Land acquisition and state assistance	87,373,000	82,696,000	14,300,000	45,187,000	49,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime Trust Fund		15,200,000				
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,387,329,000	1,480,122,000	1,261,078,000	1,300,336,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,462,000	586,369,000	688,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	188,181,000	193,348,000	188,556,000	182,169,000	182,994,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,892,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	188,809,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	84,000,000	-68,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,795,000	107,152,000	92,751,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,189,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-689,000
Subtotal	110,984,000	107,653,000	93,251,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	-15,014,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	182,423,000	185,120,000	176,327,000	170,441,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,519,012,000	1,609,842,000	1,509,828,000	1,291,234,000	1,359,434,000	-159,578,000
Construction.....	120,450,000	125,424,000	98,033,000	107,333,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	77,096,000	151,025,000	75,146,000	82,745,000	80,846,000	+3,549,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund.....	1,998,000	-1,998,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises.....	1,998,000	1,998,000	900,000	500,000	-1,498,000
Indian direct loan program account.....	779,000	-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,990,000)	(-10,990,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	9,871,000	9,994,000	7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,871,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	(50,680,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,548,412,000	-184,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories.....	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,886,000	40,468,000	37,468,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant.....	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000
Subtotal.....	78,201,000	69,232,000	52,406,000	68,188,000	65,188,000	-13,013,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	19,800,000	-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association.....	13,574,000	10,038,000	14,818,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments.....	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	+4,900,000
Subtotal.....	23,574,000	24,938,000	29,518,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	+1,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs.....	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices						
Departmental management.....	62,479,000	64,772,000	53,919,000	57,796,000	57,796,000	-4,683,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	34,808,000	35,381,000	34,808,000	34,808,000	34,808,000
Office of Inspector General.....	23,939,000	25,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000
Construction Management.....	1,998,000	2,000,000	500,000	500,000	-1,498,000
National Indian Gaming Commission.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....	16,338,000	16,338,000	+16,338,000
Total, Departmental Offices.....	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,486,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	6,507,997,000	6,855,936,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	5,998,205,000	-508,892,000
Appropriations.....	(6,537,997,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,190,000)	(5,976,037,000)	(6,028,205,000)	(-509,892,000)
Reconciliation.....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(15,200,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,990,000)	(-10,990,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	(50,680,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research.....	193,748,000	203,798,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry.....	154,288,000	187,456,000	129,551,000	136,794,000	136,794,000	-17,474,000
Emergency pest suppression fund.....	17,000,000	-17,000,000
International forestry.....	4,987,000	10,000,000	-4,987,000
National forest system.....	1,328,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,298,688,000	1,247,543,000	1,258,253,000	-72,840,000
Forest Service fire protection.....	159,285,000	164,285,000	-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund.....	226,200,000	239,000,000	-226,200,000
Emergency appropriations.....	450,000,000	-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management.....	385,485,000	381,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction.....	199,215,000	192,338,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	163,500,000	-35,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite).....	(-44,798,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits.....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
Land acquisition.....	63,882,000	65,311,000	14,800,000	41,167,000	41,200,000	-22,682,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	4,575,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	89,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
Total, Forest Service.....	2,803,802,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,188,579,000	-637,023,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology.....	-337,879,000	-155,019,000	+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development.....	423,701,000	436,508,000	379,524,000	376,181,000	417,196,000	-6,532,000
(By transfer).....	(17,000,000)	(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite).....	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.....	187,048,000	101,028,000	151,028,000	138,028,000	146,028,000	-38,020,000
Energy conservation.....	755,751,000	923,561,000	556,371,000	576,976,000	553,293,000	-202,458,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer).....	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Economic regulation.....	12,413,000	10,500,000	6,297,000	8,038,000	6,297,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness.....	8,233,000	8,219,000	-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve.....	135,954,000	25,689,000	-135,954,000
(By transfer).....	(90,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+ 96,236,000)
Energy Information Administration.....	84,566,000	84,689,000	79,786,000	84,766,000	72,296,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy.....	1,285,687,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,588,000	1,143,569,000	1,179,863,000	-86,234,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services.....	1,709,780,000	1,816,350,000	1,725,782,000	1,815,373,000	1,722,842,000	+13,062,000
Indian health facilities.....	253,282,000	242,672,000	236,875,000	151,227,000	236,956,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service.....	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,961,800,000	-1,262,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education.....	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses.....	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute.....	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses.....	313,853,000	329,800,000	308,471,000	307,968,000	306,186,000	-5,666,000
Construction and Improvements, National Zoological Park.....	3,042,000	4,950,000	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings.....	23,954,000	34,000,000	24,954,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	+10,000,000
Construction.....	21,857,000	38,700,000	12,850,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	382,708,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,862,000	373,082,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses.....	52,902,000	54,566,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,056,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	4,016,000	9,885,000	5,500,000	7,385,000	6,442,000	+2,428,000
Total, National Gallery of Art.....	56,918,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,366,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance.....	10,323,000	10,373,000	9,800,000	10,323,000	10,323,000
Construction.....	8,983,000	9,000,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses.....	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration.....	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,259,000	88,765,000	82,259,000	-51,567,000
Matching grants.....	28,512,000	26,725,000	17,235,000	21,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts.....	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration.....	146,131,000	156,067,000	82,489,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-52,131,000
Matching grants.....	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities.....	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration.....	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	363,117,000	384,200,000	219,988,000	241,000,000	230,494,000	-132,623,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses.....	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants.....	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2,738,000	3,043,000	2,000,000			-2,738,000
Public development	4,084,000	2,445,000				-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund		1,368,000				
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,809,000	28,707,000	26,707,000	26,809,000	26,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II, Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,466,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,082,000	6,116,673,000	-894,860,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,788,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,798,000			
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,964,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,114,878,000	-1,404,362,000
Appropriations	(13,546,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,063,099,000)	(12,144,878,000)	(-1,404,362,000)
Recession	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,209,000)				
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,788,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
(By transfer)	(107,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,158,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,461,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	596,836,000	603,850,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
National Biological Service	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,985,000		-162,041,000
National Park Service	1,367,329,000	1,480,122,000	1,261,078,000	1,300,338,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey	571,482,000	566,366,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	188,806,000	199,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	84,000,000	-68,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	296,578,000	288,411,000	289,867,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,806,000	1,459,912,000	1,546,412,000	-184,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	84,170,000	81,823,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,496,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,189,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,507,997,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,180,000	5,946,037,000	5,998,205,000	-508,682,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,198,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy	1,265,687,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,569,000	1,179,853,000	-96,234,000
Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,800,000	1,961,800,000	-1,262,000
Indian Education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,680,000	52,500,000	-26,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	11,213,000	19,848,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution	362,708,000	407,450,000	360,375,000	372,892,000	373,082,000	+10,388,000
National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,461,000	56,615,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,398,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,306,000	19,373,000	16,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	8,678,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	98,484,000	110,000,000	98,484,000	-62,664,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,484,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,809,000	28,707,000	26,707,000	26,809,000	26,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,466,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,082,000	6,116,673,000	-894,860,000
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,798,000			
Grand total	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,964,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,114,878,000	-1,404,362,000

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, my young friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], did not have an easy job in crafting this bill. When we start off with a billion dollars plus, less than we had the previous year, and have to allocate the balance among some of the most important programs for the people of this country, it becomes a critical job. Much as I respect what my good friend has done, I think it is a terrible bill.

I have been here in this House a fairly long time, much of it spent working on the Interior appropriations bill. This is the first year, first time in all these years that I refused to sign the conference report on the Interior appropriations bill. Why? It is such a bad bill. It is a terrible bill.

It is so bad that only one of the Democratic conferees signed the conference report. We do not have time this morning to go into all the defects of the bill. It is a giveaway bill. It opens up the people's natural resources for the taking.

Mr. Speaker, over the years that I have been on this committee, we have tried to protect and foster the people's public resources. This bill does just the opposite. It opens the people's resources for exploitation. It turns over the Nation's wealth for the exploitation by special interests. It would cut down our ancient forests. It would enter our oil reserves much more, and it would open up the capture of our valuable minerals.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we were able for the first time, for the first time, to check the giveaways that the Mining Act of 1872 had laid the foundation for. We were able to stop the giveaways of our gold and our silver, of all of our precious metals and our precious minerals, by approving a moratorium on patents transferring lands to a mining company for, what price, \$2.50, \$5. That stopped the giveaway to an extent. We finally, in that moratorium that we prepared, we grandfathered in existing claims and some of them have matured. I will talk about them a little later. But the Members of this House recognized the moratorium as a great idea and that it should be continued. On a vote to instruct conferees, which I offered, to uphold the moratorium, the vote was 271 to 151. Ninety-five Members of the Republican Party voted to instruct the conferees to continue the patent moratorium, 95 Members of the Republican Party.

What happened in the conference, Mr. Speaker? The first motion that was made in the conference was made by a Republican conferee of the House to kill the patent moratorium. And it carried, with the votes of six Republican conferees. My good friend, the gen-

tleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who had so eloquently supported the moratorium when it passed the House in the first instance, was the only Republican to vote the other way. If carried with the votes of the majority of the Republican conferees and by the vote of one Democrat. And with that vote, down went the moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, I propose today to reinstate that moratorium. I propose to make a motion to recommit this bill to the conference in order to, by instructing the conferees, to insist upon maintaining the patent moratorium. It is still a good idea. It is still a good idea. The Members of the House who voted for that moratorium ought to vote for it. Why? Well, let me tell my colleagues what the moratorium that we had in existence for one year did. How important was it?

The moratorium held up, and this information is from the Interior Department, the moratorium held up 235 current applications involving 138,879 acres of public land containing over 15.5 billion dollars' worth of gold, silver, and other minerals. If the moratorium goes down, as it will unless my motion carries, if the moratorium goes down, these lands will be sold to the large mining corporations for next to nothing. And additionally, a new crop of patent applications for more public land and minerals will be filed at bargain-basement prices.

Waiting in the wings, Mr. Speaker, are 332,771 outstanding mining claims covering more than 6.6 million acres of public land, about the size of the State of Maryland. If the moratorium is lifted, all of these claims will be eligible for application and the loss to the American taxpayer could reach into the tens of billions of dollars.

As an example of what approval of one of these applications may be, let me cite what happened as reported in the newspapers on September 7, 1995. Interior Secretary Babbitt made headlines. He said he reluctantly had to do what he had to do. He had to sign away 110 acres of Federal land in Idaho containing minerals worth \$1 billion to a Danish company. And how much did the Danish company pay for all that property? Just \$275. And again, on September 26, 1995, Secretary Babbitt was forced to sign away title to 118 acres of public lands in Nevada worth over \$68 million in gold. For how much? For \$540.

These were patents that we could not stop. These were patents that had been grandfathered under the provisions we adopted, and there was nothing we could do to prevent them. But others can be, others can be by the patents moratorium that was approved in last year's appropriations bill. We want to put it into this bill as well. We want to get a fair deal for our valuable minerals. Nothing excessive, just a fair deal. Some compensation, some compensation for the people's wealth that is being exploited. Now we get none.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, when the time comes I propose to offer my amendment, and I urge Members of the House to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, my old friend, Chairman REGULA, did not have an easy job in crafting this bill. And while I disagree with some of the decisions he made, the major flaws in this conference report are not of his doing. The allocation for the Interior Subcommittee was far too small—\$1.1 billion less than the fiscal year 1995 amount. And while some may cheer this fact, those of us who know the Interior bill realize it has no fat; every cut we make has a direct impact on someone's life. Every dollar we cut from the Bureau of Indian Affairs means the quality of life for native American declines; every dollar we cut from low-income weatherization assistance means an elderly couple will go cold this winter; and every dollar we cut from the National Endowment for the Arts means another public school student will be deprived of art education.

The cuts to vital programs in this bill are reason enough to oppose it, but when all of the extraneous legislative riders are added, it heaps insult on top of injury.

The administration has said the President will veto this conference report unless major changes are made. I agree with the President. The Interior bill needs a higher allocation and it needs to be free of legislative riders. Then and only then will it be worthy of a Presidential signature.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The most troubling aspect of this conference report is that it devastates programs for native Americans. It does so by cutting funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs by \$388 million from the budget estimate. This crippling cut is directly targeted at programs that help Indian tribes run their reservations. If we ratify these cuts by passing this conference report, we will not only be harming one of the most impoverished and vulnerable segments of our society, but we will be breaking yet another treaty with the Indian people.

Under this conference report, the tribal priority allocation at the Bureau of Indian Affairs is \$122 million less than it was in the House-passed version of the bill. This catastrophic reduction will decimate programs operated by tribal governments, including: child welfare services, higher education scholarships, adult vocational training, social services, and housing repairs. In addition, health and education programs for native Americans are inadequately funded. All totaled, these cuts will result in massive increases in unemployment, crime, hunger, illness, and a general deterioration of tribal communities.

One cannot help but think of the words from Dee Brown's classic novel, "Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee."

They made us many promises, more than I can remember, and they only kept one; they promised to take our land, and they did.

Through treaties and other agreements, the American Indians turned over their land, cultural traditions, and general way of life to the U.S. Government in exchange for secure lands, housing, medical care, and education. But once again our Government is undermining supposedly iron-clad agreements. Yet again the Great Father is devastating American Indians, just as we did at Wounded Knee in 1890.

There is also a little-noticed provision in this bill that singles out a small Indian tribe in Washington State and punishes them even further for simply wanting to defend the water rights they were given by our Government. The Lummi Indians are a proud and honorable people and they simply want the Government to live up to their promises. Instead, this bill hammers them into giving up their water rights or have their Federal funds cut in half. This cruel provision has no place in an Interior Appropriations bill.

MINING MORATORIUM

I would like to address the lifting of the mining patent moratorium in the conference report. This is a very disturbing development and may be one of the most egregious acts committed on the American public by the Republican leadership since the so-called revolution of the 104th Congress.

As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle work to slash and cut assistance to those who need it most, welfare for the mining industry has been given new life. As you all know, the mining patent moratorium expires on September 30, 2 days from now, if it is not explicitly continued in the Interior appropriations bill. Once this happens the give away of public lands will once again start in earnest.

I find it ironic that the Republican majority litters the airwaves with rhetoric about reducing the deficit. They say one thing, but talk is cheap, about \$2.50 to \$5 an acre. This reminds me of the Teapot Dome scandal which occurred during the twenties, when then Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall, went to jail as a result of having given, really as a gift, the oil belonging to the people of the United States. It seems the Teapot Dome scandal is happening all over again, but maybe we should call it the Land Plot scandal. If my Republican colleagues really want to cut the deficit why are they willing to give away our precious minerals and ores. I would like to share with you what the Federal Government receives for development of resources on public lands.

Resources on Public Lands	Compensation
Oil	12.5 percent of gross.
Natural gas	12.5 percent of gross.
Coal, surface mined	12.5 percent of gross.
Coal, underground	8 percent of gross.
Gravel	Full fair market value.
Building stone	Full fair market value.
Calcium	Full fair market value.
Clay	Full fair market value.
Sulphur	5 percent of gross value.
Phosphate	5 percent or more of gross.
Sodium	2 percent or more of gross.
Potash	2 percent or more of gross.
Gold	Free of charge.
Copper	Free of charge.
Silver	Free of charge.
Uranium	Free of charge.
Molybdenum	Free of charge.

This is very upsetting to me, as I am sure it is to my colleagues who voted overwhelming 271 to 153 in support of the Klug amendment retaining this moratorium. Yet, by the slimmest of margins the House conferees subverted the will of this body and receded to the Senate position, even after being instructed to do otherwise.

If my colleagues would indulge me I would like to take this opportunity to read the comments of one of our most learned colleagues on this subject.

... We are literally giving our rich mineral resources—our gold, our silver, our platinum—away to foreign interests for bargain basement prices.

It is possibly the biggest travesty in Government and yet it has been happening under

an antiquated 1872 law. The Mining Policy Center reported estimates that since 1872 the Federal Government has given away more than \$231 billion of mineral resources belonging to the public, either by patent or by royalty-free mining on public lands. . . . these figures are a clear indication that the Government is not receiving a reasonable return for the taxpayers under the current law. I find it incomprehensible that we are willing to give away the public lands with virtually no compensation.

Chairman REGULA spoke these eloquent words on behalf of the American people September 13, 1994, ensuring the fiscal year 1995 Interior appropriations conference report prohibited the Interior Department from processing new mining claims on Federal land. In the short time the moratorium has been in place, it has saved American taxpayers millions of dollars by blocking the Federal Government from giving away precious minerals and ores to foreign mining companies who take advantage of an ancient law that allows them to mine on our public lands for almost nothing.

This very troubling feature of the conference report has caused the administration to threaten a veto of this bill. In a statement by Vice President AL GORE the lifting of the moratorium was singled out as one of the primary reasons the President will not sign this legislation and is why I cannot lend my support to my good friend and colleague RALPH REGULA in his maiden voyage as chairman.

I certainly hope all of the Members who voted for the Klug amendment will not give in to the pressure of the mining industry, but instead reaffirm their support for ending this corporate welfare by voting for a motion to recommit.

NATIONAL FORESTS

This bill does more than just betray our trust with the Indian people and expand subsidies for mining companies, it also devastates our national forests.

The conference report to be ratified here today will dramatically increase logging on our already overtaxed forests. While funding for forest research, recreation and state and private forestry is slashed, this bill actually increases the appropriation for timber sales management and timber road construction.

This conference report also contains a legislative rider that would force the Forest Service to adopt Alternative P in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. Alternative P is a radical forest management plan that has been rejected by the Forest Service and the Governor of Alaska because it would wreak ecological havoc on the Tongass.

What's more, this conference report also contains sufficiency language—a rider which prevents all environmental law from being enforced in the Tongass. The Endangered Species Act is dismissed, the National Environmental Policy Act is waived, the Clean Water Act is ignored and all other applicable laws are considered irrelevant. In addition, this sufficiency language prevents all citizens, environmentalists and private land owners alike, from exercising their rights to sue the Federal Government.

If we adopt this conference report we will be rejecting the judgment of the Forest Service, we will be putting a great forest at risk and we will be setting a dangerous legal precedent.

NEA AND NEH

And this bill doesn't just stop at ravaging our environmental heritage, it also cripples our cul-

tural heritage. This conference report will cut the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities by nearly 40 percent. These cuts are far out of proportion to the total reduction in this bill.

I wonder if we all fully understand the impact these cuts will have on our society. Performances will be cancelled, museums will close, and art education opportunities in our schools will be cut back sharply. And while every segment of our country will suffer from these deplorable cuts, none will be hurt more than the children.

The conferees also adopted legislative language which dictates what types of art the NEA is allowed to fund. This rider, the so-called Helms language, is blatantly unconstitutional and has the heavy handed overtones of former communist countries which decided what art and literature were acceptable for the people. I sincerely hope this House does not want to get in the business of deciding what books are appropriate and what paintings are offensive.

All of these cuts and legislative riders are indicative of the warped priorities in this conference report. Do we really want to cut weatherization funding for poor families by \$100 million, as this bill does, at the same time we increase spending on low-priority research and development projects? Do we really want to gut funding for endangered species programs? Do we really want to cut funding for the National Park Service by \$68 million? Do we really want to harm the Indian people? Do we really want to give away precious minerals on Federal land for next to nothing? Do we really want to subvert the will of Congress and the desires of the people of California by eliminating our newest National Park, the Mojave National Preserve? Do we really want to censor art? I know I don't want to and I don't think the American people do either.

There are a few bright spots in this conference report and I want thank our chairman for his enormous assistance with the Holocaust Museum; thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to salute the staff. They did an excellent job under very difficult circumstances.

But sadly, the fact remains, this bill hurts Americans, all Americans, in a profound way. And this is why Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 44 years, I must vote against an Interior appropriations conference report.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time and rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, all members of the Committee on Appropriations realize the difficulty this year we have all had in putting a bill together and still honoring our commitment to balance the budget, at least by the year 2002. If I had had my druthers, we would have not terminated the Bureau of Mines, but I understand that was a compromise, so we accept this.

Mr. Speaker, I will pose a question to the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman REGULA.

As I understand it, the conference report to H.R. 1977 contains \$13.7 million for the Department of Energy's industrial advanced turbine system program. The mission of the program is to

develop more efficient gas turbine systems for industrial power generation. Implementation of the turbine program will help keep U.S. manufacturers on the cutting edge of turbine technology for power generation applications and enhance our Nation's economic competitiveness.

Is it your intent that the \$13.7 million provided by your subcommittee for 1996 be used to fund each of the two projects selected for the industrial advanced turbine systems program so that they have the opportunity to participate in the full-scale prototype demonstration phase?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding of the conference agreement.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for including this.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking and congratulating the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], our chairman, for the way he has handled this bill. I greatly appreciate his courtesy and cooperation, and I want the gentleman to know that I genuinely regret that I cannot support the end product of his work.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this conference report deserves to be defeated. Congress should not pass it. If it is passed, it should be vetoed, and that veto should be sustained.

It is true that there are some good things in this report. For example, in terms of funding, the report is better than the bill when it left the House.

Overall funding levels, however, fall far short of meeting our responsibilities, whether with regard to programs for Native Americans, or proper stewardship of this country's natural and cultural resources, for energy-related research, and for fostering the arts and humanities that enrich our national life.

These shortfalls are not really surprising. They reflect the serious imbalance in the overall Republican budget plan, which overemphasizes new weapons and cutting taxes for well-off Americans at the expense of needed domestic programs.

Even worse, this conference report is loaded with riders, some of them merely unwise and shortsighted restrictions on spending, others far-reaching legislative provisions of exactly the kind that the normal rules prohibit.

Why is this happening? Well, the pattern could not be clearer. Some of the riders continue and expand the Republican leadership's sneak attack on our environment and natural resources, while others are old-fashioned sweetheart deals with friends and supporters. I will not take the time to go through the full list of these bad items, but I do want to mention a few.

For starters, there is the language about the gold and other so-called hard rock minerals found on Federal lands. For too long the American people, the property owners, have been short-changed. Under the obsolete mining law of 1872, the Secretary of the Interior has no choice but to sell these lands for a pittance.

Our appropriations bill for last year included a moratorium on these bargain basement sales. We tried to extend that in a strong bipartisan vote when this bill left the House and later insisted on it in instruction to conferees.

So what did the conference produce? Well, not only does it not include the moratorium, it actually would require the Secretary to speed up the processing of these patent applications.

Other bad provisions here deal with the national forests. The House bill was not all it should have been, but the Senate bill was really bad, with provisions, for example, to force the Forest Service to sell off more timber in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska.

So what happened in conference? Well, it was to make the bad Senate bill even worse, adding language intended to block any challenge to expanded cutting in areas where the Forest Service wants to protect fish and wildlife and other important values. That is wrong, and we should not support it.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I could talk about the provisions in the conference report that would also block grazing reform, and many, many others, but I think the point has been made. This conference report deserves to be defeated.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. Due to the funding allocation we had to work with, it has been very difficult to put together responsible legislation. But we have done it.

The conference report to H.R. 1977 puts us squarely on the side of reducing the deficit. The bill spends \$1.4 billion less than last year, for a 12-percent savings.

As I said, drafting this legislation has been difficult. We had to eliminate 4 different agencies and eliminate over 35 individual programs to meet our budget cuts. For each of us on the conference committee, that meant accepting some very difficult cuts.

This conference report is proof that we are serious about reducing spending. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and to oppose any attempts to change it. We have crafted a carefully balanced bill that spreads the pain of deficit reduction as evenly as possible.

I would like to say something about provisions in the conference report re-

lating to mining. The conference report moves significantly toward mining law reform. Instead of a moratorium on mining on Federal land, it includes a requirement that mining companies pay fair market value for the land. It also includes provisions that return the land back to the Federal Government if ever used for non-mining purposes.

These mining provisions in the conference report are a huge step forward in reforming the mining law to ensure a fair return to the Treasury and to protect the environment.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report and to reject attempts to recommit the measure. A moratorium would yield nothing—no increased revenue, no protection from abuses of the mining law. A moratorium on issuing new mining patents would do nothing but ensure the status quo.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report without any changes, and oppose the anticipated motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this debate, a motion will be made to recommit this conference report with instructions.

This motion, to be offered by Mr. YATES, only concerns the mining claim patent issue, and I would urge the Members to support it.

My friends, a cruel hoax is being perpetrated on the American public. It is cruel indeed.

For contained in this conference report is a provision which will allow billions of dollars worth of valuable minerals underlying Federal lands to be transferred to private interests for free under the mining law of 1872.

This provision exists despite a national outcry against this 19th century practice that continues to this day.

It exists despite a bipartisan amendment which passed in this body by an overwhelming vote last July aimed at halting this practice.

A vote of 271 to 153, on an amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin, SCOTT KLUG, and myself.

It exists despite a motion to instruct House conferees to insist on retaining the language of this amendment in its dealings with the other body.

And it exists despite the alleged preoccupation of some Members of this body that the Government should be run more like a business.

Well, my friends, what business, what individual, would allow minerals underlying land that they owned to be given away for free?

Who, in their right mind, would say, hey, what a great deal, pay me the value of the surface of my land and you can have the underlying gold, or silver, for no charge?

Yet, this is what is contained in the conference agreement before us today.

The House, last July, took a strong stand in seeking to extend a moratorium on the issuance of mining claim patents.

This was done on a bipartisan basis. Liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat, we agreed that it is time to put a halt to allowing public lands containing billions of dollars' worth of minerals to be patented for a mere \$2.50 an acre.

Yet, the purveyors of the special interests had a different idea.

Scarifying the public interest on the altar of corporate welfare, they sought, and succeeded, in getting the conference committee to include in this legislation what amounts to sham reform of the mining law of 1872.

I urge every Member to vote in support of the recommittal motion, so that the public, at least in this instance, can receive some assurance that the Congress is not in the business of squandering their natural resource heritage for a pittance of its fair market value.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit, because it is not the concept of special interests per se; it is taking a special interest in the hard-working men and women who are risking their lives daily and making a decent and honorable living by mining this Nation's resources so that this Nation can continue to prosper.

My friend from West Virginia came forward and offered some points that I think need to be addressed. No. 1, it is important to remember that in the western United States, for example, in Gila County, AZ, 97 percent of the land is under Federal control.

Have there been problems in the past? Certainly. But the conference report provides rational, reasonable reform. Gone are the days when someone can file a patent and then take that land for nonmining purposes. We are getting rid of that.

Mr. Speaker, do not be deceived. It is time to stand up for American jobs. It is time to recognize the reality that this Nation as a whole prospers when the mining industry and those working in that industry are allowed to continue to earn an honest day's wage.

So that is the special interest I rise to defend, the hundreds, indeed, thousands, of hard-working men and women in the Sixth District of Arizona who will lose jobs if we file this moratorium and in essence hang up a sign on the western United States saying "Closed for business." Because, rest assured, Mr. Speaker, if we do that, then we will sound the death knell for the mining industry in the western United States and we will send jobs out of this Nation to foreign shores. And instead of the dreaded corporate welfare, well, friends, we will have genuine welfare,

as we make honest, law-abiding citizens wards of the State.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. This committee had a significant problem in terms of 1 billion dollars' worth of cuts that they had to make in terms of the overall budget. But the fact of the matter is instead of going after the waste that is in the departments and the agencies that they have had, within their review instead of going after the programs in terms of corporate welfare, in terms of the timber roads, in terms of the mineral extraction laws, of grazing permits, instead of many other exploitive policies, they chose to take those dollars out of the Bureau of Indian Health. They chose to cut down the Indian Education Program. They chose to short-change the land management agencies and the jobs they are trying to do, to abandon the Columbia River study project. They chose to turn their back on the natural resources and the protection of those resources, and yielded instead to the robber barons of the 19th century operating in 1995.

These individuals for many years have received and exploited the lands of this Nation, have harvested the timber; and not just harvested it for a profit, but at the expense of the taxpayer. When you add in the timber roads, the rehabilitation, the other things that have to go on, the taxpayers actually lose tens of millions of dollars. Most egregious, of course, is the rejection of the moratorium on the patenting of mineral claims.

The fact of the matter is the moratorium is no victory. It is a stalemate, and that keeps the pressure on for real mining reform. But what they do in this legislation is they say that the 600 claims must be accelerated claims in terms of acting on the claims and granting patents therefore giving this land away at so-called fair market value in the West and in other places in this country where the land value is very, very low, to give away those billions of dollars worth of minerals, which is the legacy and the property of future generations and of this generation.

□ 1115

If we want to deal with the deficit, we cannot go back and then serve the special interests in this particular legislation. That is what happens in this legislation, cut and slash again and again, programs, that are important to people, programs that provide for the protection of our natural resource legacy. To squander money by opening up the Tongass Forest, demanding we will cut and harvest more timber there, where it costs us taxpayer dollars to do that, and it costs us millions of dollars to do it, this bill is an outrage; not just wasting taxpayer dollars but destroying our natural resource legacy.

It is a shame and it is a sham, the type of mining reform that is in this legislation. It should be soundly defeated, and we should be voting for the Yates motion, as we did initially for at least a mining patent moratoria. We should be voting for that motion to send this back to conference, at least so we can get the mineral patent moratorium in place.

The President needs to and has pledged to veto this bill, and it richly deserves our no vote and it deserves a veto by the President so that we can get some sound policy and sound deficit reduction in the process of public policy setting in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Department of Interior appropriations bill. This legislation, which is based on pseudoscience, fails in terms of priorities, process, policy, and the pragmatic. I strongly urge defeat of the conference report for H.R. 1977.

Under this bill, the Federal Government stewards are prevented from carrying out the basic responsibilities with which they have been charged, protecting the land and water resources of our Nation. The Members of Congress and the professional land managers have a sworn duty to protect wildlife and biological diversity, to preserve the environmental value of our national parks, and to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation. The conference report essentially abdicates such commonsense responsibilities and constructs a new set of priorities in which the rights of the American people to use and enjoy the public lands of our Nation finish dead last behind a wide variety of special interests, in essence the users who exploit public resources.

During the course of consideration, the majority simply circumvented the normal legislative process. This measure is not just a spending bill, this encompasses wholesale policy. In Congress, the House strictly separates policymaking authority changes from the appropriations spending and this is done for good reason. There has been no in-depth open debate and hearings on the policy changes which are being directly sent to the President. The public has not had an adequate opportunity to examine the policy path that is being advanced, much less the Members of Congress. We have completely rewritten the Endangered Species Act, forestry laws, and land management laws behind doors closed to all but a select few. This is not in keeping with the American tradition of representative government: the American people have a right to know that significant policy changes are being made and they have a right to know the direction of the new policy path.

Mr. Speaker, there is a simple reason these crucial policy decisions were tacked on to the Interior appropriations bill instead of being considered independently: these policies were added as riders because on their own, they do not stand up to scrutiny. This is bad policy based on distorted science and values. The American people do not support it. Such change would not be sustained in the heat of open debate.

Many successful programs are seriously underfunded or even eliminated in this bill. The majority has made these cuts in the name of deficit reduction but the cuts are not fair or balanced rather money is wasted on timber

sales, roads and construction that is being forced on the land management agencies while Indian education is eliminated and Indian health programs short changed. I support deficit reduction, but this is not the way to achieve the goal of controlling spending. Problems we face in managing our natural resources will not go away just because we ignore them, and disregarding these issues will only cost the American taxpayer more in the long run.

The moratorium on new listing under the Endangered Species Act of animals and plants as endangered or threatened will only increase the cost of recovery down the road. There is ample scientific evidence that we need to be proactive in species management if we are to succeed in recovering species with reasonable cost and regulation. Eliminating the National Biological Survey [NBS], which has undertaken crucial research on species, will only exacerbate the difficulty and increase the cost of preserving endangered species. Moreover, it is hypocritical for this Congress to call for better science and then deny funding for the NBS, an agency specifically set up to conduct unbiased scientific research.

Eliminating the Bureau of Mines, which has been very successful in improving mine safety, is also shortsighted. Not only will there be economic repercussions to the elimination of this agency, there will be a significant human cost as workers in the mining industry face more dangerous conditions in their place of work.

The catalog of questionable policy decisions included in this bill stretches on well beyond those policies I have just mentioned. The mining patent moratoria to prevent the public land giveaways under the 1872 mining law are eliminated, energy conservation and weatherization programs are severely reduced or eliminated, historic preservation efforts are crippled, new guidelines to set minimum national standards for the management of Federal lands used by Western ranchers to graze livestock are postponed, and the Forest Service will be forced to implement an unsound management plan for the Tongass National Forest. Furthermore initiatives to provide reordination of existing rights of ways on public lands is set aside. These actions simply personify the mismanagement and political interference regards professional stewardship and the law.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report severely undermines our national legacy of conservation, it fails in terms of process, and it fails in terms of policy. We must remember that the policies and programs already in place to carry out the mission of the Interior Department are not the work of Democrats or Republicans alone. Instead, they are derived from years of deliberation, of listening and responding to the core conservation and preservation values and ethic of the American people. This conference report reflects a failure to uphold the deliberative process that underlies the American tradition of conservation. We can and must do better than this. I urge defeat of the bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us here have been elected to represent the 600,000 people in each of our respective districts, but each of us also knows that we need to put always the inter-

ests of our great country ahead, No. 1. We are all Americans and we are proud of our heritage and this body.

Today, we have a terrible deficit and debt, \$5 trillion. Each of us has to look under every rock and stone to try to get that deficit down. Somehow, though, certain interests have been able to keep mining royalties tied to 1872 law. That is ridiculous, and what a bargain for them.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that if this bill goes forward there are interests that have a lock on about 1,200 acres of land that they are going to be able to put a claim on for about \$8,000 or \$9,000, and they are going to make a windfall profit of \$10 billion on that money that they invest. That is not right. That is not right at all.

In fact, that is why the Citizens Against Government Waste say this, and I will include the letter for the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, the letter reads, in part, as follows: "Dear Representative. In July, the House voted 271 to 153 against corporate special interests. This sounds like reform, but it is not; it is pure corporate welfare. As much as \$15.5 billion in taxpayer-owned minerals will be sold beginning September 30 if the moratorium is not renewed." That is tomorrow.

"Instead of taxpayers receiving billions in return from these sales, CBO estimates that the Senate reforms will provide a mere \$150 million over 7 years. Simply put, a moratorium period must be adopted to allow for more comprehensive reform."

"The Interior Department estimates this single action could result in the issuance of 600 patents covering 230,000 acres of taxpayer land in the next 2 years. The Citizens Against Government Waste urge you to support the motion to recommit and pass mining claim patent moratorium language."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Interior appropriation bill unless we also pass and adopt the motion to recommit. The rape and pillage of taxpayers across this country has got to stop and we can do it with this motion, and I hope that we are successful.

CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The 600,000 members of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW) urge you to support the motion to recommit the FY 1996 Interior Appropriations conference report and instruct the conferees to renew the moratorium on patent applications for public lands.

In July, the House of Representatives boldly voted 271-153 against corporate special interests and extended the moratorium for another year. However, during the conference, a Senate provision was adopted which lifts the patent moratorium and allows mining claim patents for the price of the land surface. This sounds like reform, but it's not: it's pure corporate welfare. As much as \$15.5 billion in taxpayer-owned minerals will be sold beginning September 30 if the moratorium is not renewed. Instead of taxpayers receiving billions in return from these sales, CBO estimates the Senate reforms will provide a mere \$150 million over seven years. Simply put, a moratorium period must be

adopted to allow for more comprehensive reform.

The Interior Department estimates this single action could result in the issuance of more than 600 patents covering 230,000 acres of taxpayer land in the next two years. CCAGW urges you to support the motion to recommit and pass mining claim patent moratorium language.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. SCHATZ,
President.
JOE WINKELMANN,
Chief Lobbyist.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE]. (Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep opposition to this bill. Amongst many other things, it prematurely terminates three vital initiatives that protect fishery habitat in the Northwest, amongst many other bad cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my unmitigated opposition to this bill. From funding decreases in land acquisition and energy conservation to the termination of the National Biological Survey and the Office of Indian Education, this bill is so packed with ill-advised cuts that it would take me an hour just to list them all. At the top of the list, however, is this bill's treatment of our Nation's sports and commercial fisheries.

First, this bill prematurely restricts and terminates three vital initiatives to protect fisheries habitat in the Northwest—PACFISH, INFISH, and the Upper Columbia Basin assessment. These measures are designed to ensure that activities in the region's national forests don't harm important spawning and rearing habitat for trout and salmon.

Second, this bill drastically slashes funding for land acquisition. If we are serious about protecting private property rights, we must purchase the lands necessary to provide the habitat for fish and wildlife.

And third, this bill terminates all funding for new species listings under the Endangered Species Act. We are simply putting our heads in the sand if we think that stopping agencies from listing species will somehow magically make endangered species problems go away.

On the west coast, we are struggling to reverse the decline of our world famous salmon runs. As recently as 1988, these salmon contributed more than \$1 billion and 60,000 jobs annually to our regional economy. Since then, however, salmon fishing revenues have dropped by 90 percent because of declining populations.

To those of you who think that gutting funding for the ESA or habitat protection or land acquisition will help the economy, I say go talk to the unemployed fisher men and women in my district, go talk to the bankrupt tackle shop owners in Idaho, go talk to the thousands of recreational fisher men and women in this country who may never be able to catch a salmon in the Pacific Northwest again, go talk to the native Americans whose culture and religion rely on salmon that will soon no longer exist.

Yes, we need to reduce the deficit. But the priorities in this bill are all wrong. We can do better than this. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking chair, for yielding time to me.

I want to respond to my good friend from Arizona who took the well and very legitimately and forcefully defended the mining jobs in his district. Mr. Speaker, what is important to note here in this moratorium is we are not talking about a moratorium on mining. Plenty of mining goes on and will still be able to go on, on unpatented claims. What we are talking about is a moratorium on the issuance of patents on Federal claims, which is the transfer from Federal ownership to private ownership.

Mr. Speaker, plenty of mining goes on, on unpatented claims. We are not going after the jobs in the district of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] or the district of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. In addition to that fact, there are plenty of royalties, State taxes paid by mining companies today, yet mining continues, jobs are provided. The only problem with the regime today is that the Federal taxpayers get nothing for the disposition of their resources.

State governments do, yes; other companies do, yes; but not the true owners of the land, the Federal taxpayer. That is the issue here. It is not a moratorium on mining.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. This bill represents nothing less than an assault on the environment.

You know, one reason that I'm proud to be a Republican is that I think our party looks to the future—we expect people to make sacrifices today to protect the Nation's well-being tomorrow. That's the idea behind many of our welfare reform proposals. That's why we believe in balancing the budget; we don't want to saddle future generations with our mistakes.

But in the bill before us now, we throw that principle to the winds. We squander precious resources, robbing them from future generations. We tell wealthy mining operations that they don't have to wait, we'll give away national resources to them right now for a song. This bill violates basic Republican principles, and for what? Not to cut the deficit; this bill denies the Federal Government—the taxpayers—money that is their due, by giving away our resources.

Now, I voted for the Interior bill when it passed the House. I had some qualms about a number of items in it, but overall I thought it was an important vote for deficit reduction. But the

bill that has come back from the Senate—with its Tongass National Forest and Columbia River Basin and mining provisions—this conference report is intolerable.

I urge all my colleagues who care about the environment to vote against this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is not a good bill. Even though there is an outstanding chairman, this is not a good bill. I think on a bipartisan basis a lot of people are expressing concerns across the board about many provisions. I am going to cite the one that is most important to me and many of us that represent native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this bill cuts native American programs in education, health, housing by 11 percent. However, of all the programs within the Department of the Interior, here is the real pain: Forty five percent of these cuts are absorbed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that thousands of native American people across the country are going to face cuts on many issues affecting reservations, law enforcement, services to the elderly, road repair, housing repairs, and social services.

Here is the most devastating cut, Mr. Speaker. The elimination of the Office of Indian Education, which basically destroys our promise to native Americans that they will receive the same educational opportunities as the rest of our citizens. Four-hundred thousand Indian children are not going to get these educational opportunities.

On the environmental side, the elimination of the biological service basically says that sound science and information about biological diversity and mining safety is not as important as it should be. At a time when 50 percent of our oil comes from foreign sources, the bill slashes energy conservation by 27 percent.

The bill basically also continues the 1872 mining law, Mr. Speaker. I am a westerner, I am pro mining. I have probably as many mines as anybody here, but there is no reason for any foreign corporation, as it exists at the Yellowstone, to be able to purchase for \$2.50 a Federal acre. That is simply not right. Without this moratorium, Mr. Speaker, this is going to continue occurring.

With the endangered species, we are basically saying we are not going to do any more listings, we are not going to pay attention to endangered species, plants, animals. That is not good sound policy. The Tongass, I have been there. What are we going to do, are we going to continue the decimation of our forests?

What are we going to do about the arts, the humanities, 39 percent cut to

the National Endowment of the Arts, the Endowment of the Humanities. These are not elitist programs. These are grass roots programs that help artists, that train people, that create jobs. This is short-sighted.

Mr. Speaker, the best we can do is vote for the motion to recommit. We need to kill this bill. It will be vetoed and it will come back. The two chairmen, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. YATES, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. REGULA, are good people. They have produced far better products in the past and we expect that to happen again after the veto. But a strong vote is needed to send a message, to send a strong message that the bill as it comes out on a bipartisan basis is not a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations conference report. This conference report sets a new low even for this House: It singlehandedly abandons our commitments to native American people, devastates many important environmental statutes, and destroys our arts community.

Let me be clear that if this legislation is sent to the President's desk in its current form, it will be vetoed.

This is more than a simple appropriations bill, it is a recipe for disaster comprised of a narrow political agenda and a heavy dose of partisan politics.

I thought the message the American people sent the Congress in 1994 was that they wanted an end to business as usual. This bill does not pass the test: It sends the wrong signal at the wrong time and it should be defeated.

Continuing the Government's miserable track record of keeping our word on Indian treaties, this bill further reduces vitally important funding for a wide array of Indian health, education, and housing services provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs [BIA] by 11 percent. However, of all the programs within the Department of the Interior, the BIA is absorbing 45 percent of all the cuts.

These harsh cuts will mean that thousands of native American people across the country will face cuts in law enforcement on reservations, services to the elderly, road repair, housing repairs, and social services. These cuts literally hit Indians where they live. This will be felt from the hogans on the Navajo reservation to the tarpaper shacks of Pine Ridge. It will be a cold, harsh winter for all.

The elimination of the Office of Indian Education will demolish our promises to ensure that the first Americans receive the same educational opportunities as the rest of our citizens. By eliminating the Office of Indian Education this bill eliminates educational opportunities for half-a-million Indian children and adults.

Indian children are about 3 times as likely as their peers to drop out of high school. Today, 36.2 percent of all native American children live in poverty. Native American students on average score 15 percent lower than their peers on standardized tests. Only 9 percent of native Americans have a 4-year degree compared with 20 percent of other Americans. Yet, this bill eliminates programs for dropout prevention and special education for gifted and talented students.

This bill eliminates the Native American Fellowship Program, which makes awards to native American graduate students to study in the fields of medicine, education, psychology, law, business administration, and engineering. Once students complete their education, they must return to native American communities to practice their professions.

And let me set the record straight about something else—native American tribes are not seeking handouts. They are seeking to have promises that were made in treaties and statutes fulfilled. The Federal Government has a solemn duty to live up to its promises to sovereign Indian nations. This bill turns its back on this obligation and leaves the first Americans with less support, few resources, and yet another broken promise.

As if that were not bad enough, this bill devastates environmental programs. At a time when sound science and information about biological diversity and mining safety is more critical than ever, this bill eliminates the National Biological Service and the Bureau of Mines. At a time when nearly 50 percent of our oil comes from foreign sources, this bill slashes energy conservation program funding by 27 percent meaning that our dependence on foreign oil will only increase.

This bill would eliminate the moratorium on mining claim patents, thereby continuing the yard sale policies of the 1872 mining law which Congress refuses to update and reform. Without this moratorium, foreign-owned mining companies will be able to buy up our land for as little as \$2.50 an acre, remove any and all of our precious natural resources and abandon the land without cleaning up the mess they have made. The American West is already littered with many of these mining disasters. This bill will create thousands more.

This bill bars the listing of any new endangered species until the end of fiscal year 1996 or until legislation reauthorizing the act is enacted. It also bars the use of funds to designate critical habitat for species which have already been listed, risking our chance to save endangered populations of plants and animals.

This bill delays the implementation of new grazing regulations, despite the fact that the Resource Advisory Councils [RAC's] established by these regulations are already in place in many States and are moving forward with bipartisan recommendations for rangeland management.

In my State of New Mexico, our Lieutenant Governor, a Republican, has said that "ranching interests are well-represented on the council." And Fran Gallegos, appointed by the Lieutenant Governor to serve as chair of the State's council, has said that "I will not allow political agendas to mar the work we are beginning now." And while this kind of bipartisan consensus-building is occurring in New Mexico and in other States, Congress is preparing to stop the RAC's and delay implementation of any changes in rangeland management while we wait for new legislation to be enacted. I fail to understand why yet another bureaucratic process is necessary while thousands of hard-working men and women who make their living from the land wait for a conclusion to this issue. It is time to put it behind us. Unfortunately, this bill would make us begin all over again and reinvent the wheel.

And in yet another giveaway to corporate interests, this bill would increase logging in Alaska's Tongass National Forest, denuding

yet another section of our precious national forests for a quick buck. And the bill goes even further to prohibit the Forest Service from setting aside additional acreage in the Tongass as areas where logging would be barred in order to protect wildlife.

Even though the contribution of every American to our arts and humanities amounts to less than the cost of two postage stamps, this bill reduces funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by 39 percent. Even though every industrial nation in the world has some kind of government program to support the arts, this bill calls for the elimination of the National Endowment for the Arts in 3 years. Furthermore, the National Endowment for the Humanities is cut by 36 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting it down. The American people did not send us to Washington to pollute their air and water, destroy our arts community and abandon our commitments to those who lived here first. I urge a "no" vote on this bad bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct something. The gentleman mentioned that the Office of Indian Education had been terminated. That is not accurate because in the House we added back \$52.5 million for that office, and we maintained that in the conference committee. So there is now \$52.5 million for the Office of Indian Education.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just to reintroduce exactly what the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] said, because one of the most troubling aspects of this conference report is that it devastates programs for the native Americans. I just cannot understand the attitude of this House. How can we overlook the history of our irresponsible crushing of the Indian people over the centuries?

Mr. Speaker, this conference report compounds that irresponsibility. It does so by cutting funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs by \$288 million from the budget estimate. This crippling cut is directly targeted at programs that help Indian tribes operate their reservations. If we ratify these cuts by passing this conference report, we will not only be harming one of the most impoverished and vulnerable segments of our society, but we will still be breaking another treaty with the Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Speaker, on the matter of the native Americans, the conference came up from the Senate \$86.5 million. The House had a substantially higher number, the Senate was much lower, and we did restore a good portion of that and we allocated most of the increase to the tribal priority allocations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

□ 1130

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a case where a very good Member is bringing us a very bad bill, and I am sorry about it, but I just cannot bring myself to support it.

Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at what this bill does to the Tongass; if we take I look at what it does to the Bureau of Indian Affairs; if we take a look at what it does to the California Desert Act; if we take a look at what it does on mining, as has been discussed often this morning, my only question would be where is Bill Proxmire when we really need him? If Bill was here, he would absolutely give this bill the Golden Fleece Award for this Congress, because this bill, which is above all supposed to be a bill that protects the public's interest, instead caves in to the private interests.

Mr. Speaker, the worst of all offenses is what has been done or what has not been done to reform the mining law. As I pointed out on the floor yesterday, under existing law, Interior was forced last year to sign away land under which was located an estimated \$10 billion in gold, and they had to sell it for 10,000 bucks. Under the so-called reforms working their way through this place, that price tag would rise to 100,000 bucks. Big deal.

Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me that the only logical thing for this House to do, if we care about defending the public's interest, is to support the recommitment motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], repair this bill, at least in one way. That still does not mean that the bill would be worth passing, in my view, because of all of the other problems. But at least it would fix up a notorious rip-off of the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report as it is written and to oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, there were, some would argue, good and valid reasons to have a moratorium on mining in America. There were three arguments. One was land was being sold at giveaway prices, \$2.50 to \$5 an acre.

The second was land that was being patented or mining was not being used for mining, it was being used for some other purpose.

The third was the fact that there was no royalty being paid. This process is designed to address problems like that, and this bill has done that.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report, which I urge my colleagues to read and to pay attention to, makes these issues clear. In legislation which we have adopted, in fact, there now is a provision that the full market value of the land has to be paid. There is no

giveaway. So the first argument has been dealt with.

Second, there is a reverter provision. If on any occasion the land is not used for the mining purposes, it reverts automatically. The second issue is dealt with. Both of those are dealt with in the conference committee report itself.

But third and finally, the issue of a royalty is also dealt with in both the House and Senate reconciliation legislation. A royalty will be paid. There may, indeed, have been good reasons for those who were interested in them to impose a mining moratorium, but they were resolved in this report. I urge my colleagues to recognize we have fixed those problems.

The miner moratorium hurts jobs and hurts people. For the other side, for those who oppose it to say we do not need minerals in America, we are anxious to protect jobs, but we do not care about miners jobs, so we do not need minerals produced in America and we can buy those minerals from overseas, they miss so much of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, we need those jobs here in America and in the western United States. I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and to support this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, merely to point out to the gentleman that we are not getting the full value of the land. We are getting the value of the surface of the land. We are not getting the value of the minerals that lie below the land. The value of that land, with its dust and its scrub and its rocks and consisting of land that nothing can grow on, is bound to be practically nil.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the President: Mr. President, this bill is probably going to get to your desk. On behalf of the West, sir, veto it and send it back. This bill is bad for the West.

This bill is bad for the public's land, because it has in it a terrible bias toward extractive industry, an unconscionable bias.

This bill does break our word to the first Americans. America's Indian people are the least well-housed, have the highest infant mortality rate, they suffer the highest unemployment rates, they have the least length of time in which they live. This bill is going to make it worse for them. Mr. Speaker, I again say: Please, Mr. President, veto it.

This bill gives away our natural resources, particularly in the West, at bargain basement prices. It mandates timber volumes in sensitive forests. The boys in the board room are getting their greed satisfied with this bill. Mr. Speaker, I say: Mr. President, veto it.

Jim Watt must be smiling. He could have written this bill. Mr. President, veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I again say: Mr. President, out our way, we like the National

Endowment for the Arts. This bill cuts that agency almost 40 percent in the next year. And what is worse, it applies Government censorship to the grants. In the West, we do not like censorship. Mr. Speaker, I say: Mr. President, veto this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING). The Chair must remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others, such as the President.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on Interior appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I am the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee with jurisdiction over mineral resources on the public lands. I believe the conference report language on mining claims solves a problem.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to fix an outdated law, not since 1866, whereby miners pay a fixed price of \$5 an acre for resource-rich land. None of us believe that the existing price of \$5 an acre is valid today, but there is every reason to support his conference report.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that patent applicants will pay fair market value for the land, upon enactment of this conference report. The Committee on Resources has within its budget reconciliation title legislation a measure to levy a royalty on hardrock minerals produced from public lands for the first time in 150 years.

Mr. Speaker, why would any of us not support his opportunity to charge fair market value for mineral patents and receive royalty?

Mr. Speaker, I urge acceptance of this conference report.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit the Interior appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report language does answer one of the critical issues that we are dealing with with regard to mining reform, and that is it does require a fair market value to be paid for the land in a mining claim.

The other issue that is talked about so much is whether a royalty will be paid for the right to mine the minerals under the land that will be patented. That issue is also going to be resolved. Members all know that in the reconciliation bill that is coming, an imposition of a royalty is included. The two key issues that we must address here in mining reform, plus additional mining reform issues that are going to be addressed, are under consideration and will be resolved by this House.

Mr. Speaker, the effort to recommit this bill is an effort to stall the mining

reform that we are moving forward on and we must reject this motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we all read in the last month or two where the Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, had to sell valuable mineral rights to a foreign-owned company at basement prices. And I will not even call them basement prices. The prices were so low, it was criminal that we had to give away those mineral resources.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who are environmentalists and fiscal conservatives recognize how wrong it is to give away our natural resources, especially to foreign-owned companies.

Mr. Speaker, what we should do is recommit this bill, fix this problem, and make sure that this travesty does not continue. It is wrong from an environmental standpoint, it is wrong from a fiscal standpoint, and it is wrong from an American standpoint.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the new majority came here with a call they were going to run this place like a business. Well, I do not know of any business or any family who would run their business as we are running the natural resources of this country.

Mr. Speaker, think about the term "below-cost timber sales." We sell timber at a price that is inadequate to recoup the Government's cost. We sell minerals at a price that no family, that no business would give them away for.

If we were a wealthy institution, and with all our fiscal problems this is a wealthy country, if we were impoverished, we would not sell things below cost. We certainly would not take our children's and grandchildren's assets and dispose of them in some fire sale that would destroy the land in many instances, but certainly not bring any profit.

Mr. Speaker, this is bad business; it is bad government; it is bad stewardship. Support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in opposition to this conference report and urge support for the motion to recommit this to conference.

Mr. Speaker, if this goes through as it is, it will, in most likelihood, mandate and accelerate the issuance of 600 patents of lands; a giveaway of land at fair market value for the surface, but does not take into consideration what the value of the minerals are—nearly a quarter-million acres of public land.

Mr. Speaker, years ago we changed that process with regard to coal and

oil. Why does this 19th century robber-baron attitude persist with regard to hardrock minerals, where somebody can explore and prospect for the gold, look for the value, and then come back and expect a handout from the Federal Government? The land for peanuts and the minerals for free while the taxpayer ends up holding the bag.

We cannot do that. This will result in a quarter-million acres of Federal land punctuating the entire landscape of this country, critical areas, which will be given away on this basis with no assurance as to the use and return for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, we need to keep the pressure on to get a good mining reform law to change that 1872 law. We can only do that by sending this back to conference or the President vetoing the bill. There are many other things wrong with the legislation that need to be remedied, but the mining moratorium is the debate today. Vote to send this back to conference.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we respond to what has just been said, because we must again make it clear that the legislation we are considering does require payment of fair market value for the land.

The argument has been made, "Yes, but it does not require payment for the minerals." But I say again, the reconciliation legislation that is coming does contain the royalty provision for payment of the minerals as they are extracted.

Mr. Speaker, those are the two pieces of the reform that have consistently been thrown out as the components that we must address: The value of the land and the value of the minerals. Those are both being addressed and those who would have Members support the effort to recommit this conference report simply want to stop the progress on making these needed mining reforms.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report language on mining claims solves a problem, rather than simply deferring action. When enacted, miners seeking title to their claims will pay fair market value, not \$5 an acre, which never occurred to begin with.

□ 1145

Some mining claimants have complied with present law and now qualify under present law. This is America. They have filled all the obligations required under law. If a new law is retroactively applied without grandfathering these claims, then the Federal Government will be exposed to billions of dollars in takings liabilities.

You say fine. That is the taxpayers' dollars you are talking about. That is what you are talking about here, is controlled by the Government.

These people followed the law, and we passed that law. And now you are going to make it retroactive. That is taking and the Government is susceptible to a lawsuit. Maybe you ought to be reliable yourselves. Maybe you ought to pay the bill instead of the taxpayer. If we are talking about future laws, that is different, but this applies to the present law that in fact is in effect today and those people followed that law.

A "no" vote is the right vote for this motion to recommit. If in fact a "yes" vote is the overwhelming majority or the minority, then we have taken and implemented a taking of property from a private individual, a citizen of the United States.

I have watched this from the floor before. Where this Congress thinks nothing about retroactive taxes, breaking people, taking their homes in the guise of good for all. This time if you do so, you are going to be sued. We are going to be sued. But none of us are held responsible. That is what is wrong.

I hope that the people listening to this program, all 26 million of you, understand what this Congress may do today. That is, implement a lawsuit against you, not us individually, but against the taxpayers of America.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of things I want to emphasize. We respect private property rights in this bill, perhaps more than has been historically true. We have tried to protect those. We have tried to ensure that we protect America's natural heritage.

I would have to point out, obviously we have \$1.4 billion less, and I think those who have spoken in opposition to the bill have made that case that we should have spent more. But if we are going to get a balanced budget in 7 years, it has to start somewhere. We have tried to do the things that are important.

Again, I emphasize, the parks will be open. The forests, the Smithsonian, the fish and wildlife facilities, the Kennedy Center, the National Gallery of Art, their operating budgets have been held pretty much intact, because we want the public to continue to have access to the facilities that they treasure.

We had to make it up on land acquisition and many other activities that had not as high a priority. Even on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, where it was something that affected the tribal activities, we have maintained the level of funding. On the issue of the moratorium, I think it is a policy question. Members have heard debate on both sides. Each Member will have to make his or her own decision.

We were instructed to maintain the moratorium by a voice vote and the original amendment carried 271 to 153. But there was a difference among conferees as reflected in the report.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, said that in this bill we respect private property rights. And we do. We protect private property rights. The problem is, though, we do not respect public property rights. And we give away the public property on too many occasions in giving away the opportunity to exploit the people's resources.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill and in support of the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit the Interior appropriations bill to conference and to restore the House language regarding the mining law patent moratorium.

If the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Interior Appropriations bill were a car, it would be recalled.

What it purports to do in the name of budget cutting is obscene. Not only is this appropriations bill packed with authorizing legislation as in a spending bill—in clear violation of House rules—but, it also shamelessly and against the public interest runs rampant in overturning sound environmental policy.

There are simply too many flaws in this conference report to describe each one of them, but, one of the most offensive is the elimination of the mining patent moratorium.

Despite the fact that the House has repeatedly voted for a moratorium on giving away public lands to mining companies, the conference committee adopted language that replaces the patent moratorium with a new Senate provision that is even worse than that which currently exists under the old 1872 law.

This is not an insignificant concern. It is one—if not the primary—reason the President has said he will veto this bill.

Unless the patent moratorium is restored, over 600 patent applications worth more than \$15 billion in mineral resources, currently blocked by last year's moratorium, will be given away for less than \$700,000 for whose benefit and under the banner of what kind of conservatism.

Unless the conference report is changed and the moratorium imposed—mining companies—many of them foreign-owned—will get title to an additional 230,000 acres of the public's land for a pittance of their real value. Who does this benefit?—the struggling middle class?—is this an element of the contract for America?—what kind of conservatism is this?

Ending the moratorium also means that all 330,000 mining claims—or another one million acres of public land—will be eligible for patenting or disposal to the mining industry.

People often ask us Why can't you run government more like a business?

Our inability to reform the 1872 mining law is a perfect example of both why they ask us this question and why we can't run government more like a business.

I can think of no business that gives away its assets—for free—without taking any kind of a payment. But, the Federal Government is

forced, through actions such as this legislation to virtually give-away public lands that are rich in gold and silver to mining companies. We don't even reserve a royalty or any other sort of economic payment to the public—it's just *finders keepers* under the 1872 mining law.

We have been trying for years and years to get this archaic law changed—but the mining industry and its friends in Congress have been successful in blocking those attempts.

So, we have been forced to impose a simple moratorium to stem the flow of valuable mineral properties from the public troth while we try to get meaningful reform enacted.

Just this year, because Congress has failed to reform the 1872 Mining Law, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt has been forced to sign away land worth more than \$1 billion for a pittance of its true value.

For example, the Secretary was recently compelled to sign away ownership to 109 acres of public land in Idaho containing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of a mineral called travertine to a Dutch owned corporation for the paltry sum of \$275. This looks like letting business run government for business's purpose—these are public lands, these are public assets. This legal piracy of public resources must stop. If the Republicans are serious about reforming Government, and not just interested in consolidating and moving more and more of the Nation's capital resources—upstream—to the already rich and wealthy, then they should not stand in the way of reforming the 1872 Mining law.

We should not give away permanent ownership of the public lands. We don't do that in oil, gas or coal leasing.

But, the hard rock mining industry claims to be different than all the other mineral resource and extractive industries. They claim that patenting is critical to their ability to function. But, this is a bogus argument. You do not need a patent to mine. It is absolutely irrelevant to the question of mining—unless you are trying to avoid paying a royalty if and when Congress gets around to changing the 1872 mining law.

No State gives private companies title to its resources, and yet the companies mine on State land. I know of no private citizens who give mining companies title to their land for mineral exploration and production, and yet they mine on private lands.

So why don't we change the law? It's simple—money talks, nobody walks—The mining industry spent a small fortune last year and again this year to prevent reform of the 123-year-old Mining law of 1872. It is cheaper for them to pay the lobbyists and make the campaign contributions than to see real reform enacted to safeguard the taxpayers who own this gold. As a result, we can look forward to many more giveaways like the ones Secretary Babbitt signed earlier this year—trading a fortune in public gold for a pauper's ransom.

If we do not stop patenting, through mining reform or through a patenting moratorium pending achievement of mining reform—we will see more and more public land given away in the years to come.

Unless we keep the patent moratorium in place, these lands will be given away to mining corporations that want to avoid paying a royalty.

We cannot be party to the continued looting of the Treasury by foreign gold companies and others. So we should include a patent moratorium because as a practical matter, we should

not leave the 1872 law, and particularly the patenting process, on the books should no action be taken on comprehensive reform. If we must again defer until next year—or the year after—comprehensive reform, we should hold the program in abeyance. For while we may not have agreed on the precise design of reform at the point, virtually everyone agrees drastic reform of the mining program is necessary.

So, I urge the House to recommit the conference report and insist on adoption of the House language. If we cannot achieve real reform, we will at a minimum stop the giveaway of 15 billion dollars' worth of public resources until such time as we do achieve reform.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Interior appropriations bill before us today. It is a bill rife with Federal giveaways—an interesting juxtaposition given the Republican interest in balancing the budget and reforming welfare and other programs for the poor.

The real message is: It's OK to attack welfare for the poor, but do not question Federal welfare to those who can make billions off our Federal lands with a minuscule return to the Government. Why are we offering this giveaway to those who benefit from the largesse of our natural resources, and at the expense of our public lands and our Federal Treasury?

The biggest giveaway in the bill is the fire sale of our Federal lands and their mineral deposits to a single beneficiary—the mining industry. And this is done in the name of mining reform. This isn't reform; this is a retreat.

The House is already on record opposing what the Senate has included in H.R. 1977. We voted 271 to 153 in opposition to lifting the moratorium on mining claim patents—only 2 months ago. Now, we are retreating from this vote and our position against this giveaway.

Mining companies stand to gain millions, or billions, in mining these underground resources with literally no return to the Federal Government. If this is Republican reform, then I can only imagine what is in store for the American people.

Let's look at real reform and let's stand by the vote we took in July and let's not rip off the American people.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1977 and vote to recommit the bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today, on September 29, 1965, President Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act into law. This historic act created the the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities and ushered in a new era in the cultural life of America.

At this time I would like to submit for the RECORD a newspaper article from September 30, 1965 on President Johnson signing the act.

For most of our Nation's history, one would have to travel to the largest cities in order to see and experience great art. But today, thanks in large part to the 100,000 grants made by the National Endowment for the Arts, culture and art are thriving in every corner of America. The statistics speak for themselves: in 1965 there were only 58 orchestras in the country; today there are over 1,000. Prior to the NEA there were 37 professional dance companies in America; now there are 300. In 1965, there were five State arts agencies; today, every State has a public arts agency

and there are community arts agencies in over 3,800 cities, counties and towns. Perhaps most impressive of all has been the increase in the number of people attending the theater; before 1965 only 1 million people attended the theater each year, today over 55 million attend annually.

From the great performances on public television, to touring arts exhibitions and performances, art is now available to all Americans.

By any measure, the National Endowment for the Arts has been a success. The Arts Endowment has made a difference in the lives of millions. In Chicago for instance, grants to organizations like Urban Gateways have helped tens of thousands of school children become better students through the arts. All across America, millions of children and their families have had the chance to see the masterpieces of the visual arts, hear the masterworks of American composers, and read the novels, stories and poems of America's best writers. Traditional folk arts have been resurrected. Historic buildings which add beauty and character to neighborhoods and cities have been saved and restored. In short, American culture and the American people have been profoundly changed by our small investment in the arts.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on the 30th anniversary of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, I urge my colleagues, and the nation as a whole, to reflect on the role that arts and humanities play in our lives; how we are enriched by them and how bleak our lives would be without them.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD.

[From the Morning News, Wilmington, DE, Sept. 30, 1965]

\$21-MILLION-A-YEAR BOOST—LBJ SIGNS AID-TO-ARTS BILL

(By Norman Rynn)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson turned the White House Rose Garden into a cultural center yesterday to sign a bill that makes the federal government a multimillion dollar patron of the arts.

Taking over a role played by the aristocracy in medieval times—and now carried on by governments in many European countries and the Soviet Union—the Administration will be able to pour up to \$21 million a year into support of the creative and performing arts and humanities.

Poets, painters, actors and a huge crowd of congressmen gathered in the rose garden to watch Johnson sign the bill which created a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

Now that the bill is law, Johnson said, "Let me tell you what we are going to do with it. Working together with the state and the local governments, and with many private organizations in the arts, we will:

"Create a national theater to bring ancient and modern classics of the theater to audiences all over America.

"We will support a national opera company and a national ballet company. (He did not spell out whether this would be similar to Russia's world-famous Bolshoi Ballet Co.)

"We will create an American film institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the 20th Century art form as their life's work.

"We will commission new works of music by American composers.

"We will support our symphony orchestras.

"We will bring more great artists to our schools and universities by creating grants for their time in residence."

The President declared further that "in the long history of man, countless empires and nations have come and gone. Those which created no lasting works of art are reduced today to short footnotes in history's catalogue."

"We in America have not always been kind to the artists and scholars who are the creators and the keepers of our vision. Somehow, the scientists always seem to get the penthouse, while the arts and the humanities get the basement."

It was a remark that went over well with his audience, which included such notables as composers Meredith Willson and Richard Adler; actor Gregory Peck and Hollywood director George Stevens; photographic great Edward Steichen; Impresario Sol Hurok, writers Paddy Chayefsky and Marianne Moore.

Notably absent was playwright Arthur Miller, who informed Johnson that he would not be present because he disagreed with the Administration's Vietnamese policy. It was the second such snub this year. For the same reason, poet Robert Lowell turned down an invitation in June to the White House Festival of the American Arts.

The legislation signed by the President creates a national foundation to develop policy and coordinate the work of two endowments. One would be for the humanities which would include such things as art criticism and the study of modern and classical language, and the other for the arts, including music, folk art, industrial design and the like.

There will be a basic \$5-million fund for each endowment, with additional money authorized to match nonfederal contributions for support of the arts and humanities. Each state with an arts council will get \$50,000 a year for its support, while states without the councils will get \$25,000 to help create them.

Furthermore, the U.S. Office of Education will get \$1 million to support state and local educational agency efforts to teach the arts and humanities and to train elementary and high school teachers in these fields.

The national theater and ballet and opera companies that Johnson mentioned will one day be able to perform in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which will be the nation's No. 1 cultural showpiece.

The President later in the day requested \$17,910,000 in supplemental appropriations to initiate the grant-in-aid programs under the act signed yesterday. The request was included in a \$132,993,000 supplemental appropriation request sent to Congress.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of the amendment to restore funding to the Mojave preserve which failed on the House floor, I am deeply disappointed that the Senate saw fit to accept the House language on this issue.

While there are a number of other things wrong with this measure, not the least of which is the mining issue, this back door effort to gut the California Desert Protection Act is of particular concern to me.

Congress expressed its will loudly and clearly when it passed the California Desert Protection Act in the last session. Overwhelmingly and with significant Republican support, Congress directed the National Park Service and not the Bureau of Land Management to manage the Mojave preserve.

If the new majority in this House seeks to repeal this or any other part of the Desert Act, they should introduce legislation to do that. It should be open and undisguised legislation.

We should not let the appropriations process be abused in this way.

Supporters of the Desert Act were not afraid to have open and honest debate during the years it took to get this measure enacted. Opponents should allow for the same kind of exhaustive review if they believe they have the support to repeal it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer to a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. YATES. Totally, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1977 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on Senate amendment numbered 158.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 147, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 696]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder

Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner

Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans

Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink

Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinar
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—147

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert

Camp
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett

Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoke
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kim
Knollenberg

Kolbe	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
LaHood	Orton	Spence
Largent	Packard	Stearns
Laughlin	Parker	Stockman
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Stump
Lewis (KY)	Paxon	Talent
Lightfoot	Petri	Tate
Livingston	Pombo	Tauzin
Lucas	Quillen	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Radanovich	Thomas
McInnis	Riggs	Thornberry
McIntosh	Roberts	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rogers	Vucanovich
Metcalf	Roth	Waldholtz
Mica	Salmon	Walsh
Mollohan	Saxton	Wamp
Moorhead	Schaefer	Watts (OK)
Myers	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Seastrand	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Shadegg	Wicker
Neumann	Shuster	Wilson
Norwood	Skeen	Young (AK)
Nussle	Smith (TX)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—10

Buyer	McHugh	Tucker
Collins (IL)	Porter	Walker
Fields (LA)	Reynolds	
Frost	Tejeda	

□ 1210

Mr. PETRI, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GRAHAM, WELLER, CUNNINGHAM, KINGSTON, MANZULLO, MCCOLLUM, and JONES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak for one moment for the purpose of advising Members about their travel schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a minute to advise Members that we, of course, have passed the continuing resolution through our body. It is now under consideration in the other body. We recognize the possibility of extended consideration of the continuing resolution in the other body, and, in light of that, we cannot make any hard and fast declarations about our potential departure time today. We still remain somewhat optimistic, but I thought it was only fair to alert the Members.

Of course, we must await the other body's final consideration for our final action at this point. We will try to stay in touch with them about what is going on, and I will try to keep the body informed. I remain hopeful that perhaps they can expedite their consideration and we can move on with our day's schedule.

In the meantime, as we contemplate that, we will be considering the possibility of other legislation to be brought before the body today. But we will make every effort we can, in light of

the considerations we must give the other body, to complete our work as early as we can today, so that Members can get home for their district work period.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a consultative meeting on Bosina at the White House today with a number of Members at 12:30. Is it possible we could accommodate those Members who need to be at that very important meeting without having votes interrupting?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. I, too, will be in that meeting. We are looking at all options on the schedule. We will do our best to accommodate all Members, perhaps even by delaying votes or whatever, and we will try to accommodate them.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I know a number of Members want to have the vote, if possible, so they could go to that meeting without having to leave. Is it possible that votes could be held before that time?

Mr. ARMEY. As the gentleman knows, the other body works at its own pace, and we will, of course, as we always do, wait their result.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Is there any change in the anticipated order of schedule today? Everything remains as is?

Mr. ARMEY. Not at this time. We intend to proceed as we scheduled for today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that meeting. I am also aware that we have the defense conference report for the 1996 appropriations scheduled on the floor in the next few minutes, and that that vote may come up at some point this afternoon. I would suggest to those who are conducting the meeting, that it might be wise to either hold it on Capitol Hill or reschedule it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we did receive extremely late notice from the White House, and we are trying to accommodate everyone concerned with respect to the White House request. We will make a determination and proceed with due consideration of all our Members in light of the two considerations two matters we have at the White House and the other body.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2405, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-270) on the resolution (H. Res. 234) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2405) to authorize

appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1976, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-271) on the resolution (H. Res. 235) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1215

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1289

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1289.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There is no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2399. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the intent of such Act and to reduce burdensome regulatory requirements on creditors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2099. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2099) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of

Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BOND, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HATFIELD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 144. An act to amend section 526 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize awards of attorney's fees;

S. 531. An act to authorize a circuit judge who has take part in an en banc hearing of a case to continue to participate in that case after taking senior status, and for other purposes;

S. 977. An act to correct certain references in the Bankruptcy Code;

S. 1111. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents on biotechnological processes; and

S. 1147. An act to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 895) "An Act to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the level of participation by the Small Business Administration in certain loans guaranteed by the Administration, and for other purposes".

The message also announced that in accordance with sections 1928a-1928d of title 22 United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GORTON, and Mr. AKAKA, as members of the Senate delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly Fall Meeting during the 1st session of the 104th Congress, to be held in Turin, Italy, October 5-9, 1995.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 354, noes 59, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 697]

AYES—354

Allard	Edwards	Lewis (KY)
Andrews	Ehlers	Lightfoot
Archer	Ehrlich	Lincoln
Armey	Emerson	Linder
Bachus	Engel	Lipinski
Baesler	English	Livingston
Baker (CA)	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Baker (LA)	Evans	Lofgren
Baldacci	Ewing	Longley
Ballenger	Farr	Lowey
Barcia	Fawell	Lucas
Barr	Fields (TX)	Luther
Barrett (NE)	Flake	Maloney
Barrett (WI)	Flanagan	Manton
Bartlett	Foley	Manzullo
Barton	Forbes	Markey
Bass	Ford	Martinez
Bateman	Fowler	Martini
Becerra	Fox	Mascara
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Bentsen	Franks (CT)	McCarthy
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	McCollum
Berman	Frelinghuysen	McCrery
Bevill	Frisa	McDade
Bilbray	Galleghy	McHale
Bilirakis	Ganske	McInnis
Bishop	Gejdenson	McKeon
Bliley	Gekas	McKinney
Blute	Geren	Meehan
Boehlert	Gilchrest	Meek
Boehner	Gilman	Metcalf
Bonilla	Gonzalez	Meyers
Bonior	Goodlatte	Mica
Bono	Goodling	Miller (CA)
Borski	Gordon	Miller (FL)
Boucher	Goss	Mineta
Brewster	Graham	Minge
Browder	Green	Mink
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Mollohan
Brown (OH)	Gunderson	Montgomery
Brownback	Hall (OH)	Moorhead
Bryant (TN)	Hall (TX)	Moran
Bryant (TX)	Hamilton	Morella
Bunn	Hancock	Murtha
Bunning	Hansen	Myers
Burr	Hastert	Myrick
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Nadler
Buyer	Hayes	Nethercutt
Callahan	Hefner	Neumann
Calvert	Heineman	Norwood
Camp	Herger	Nussle
Canady	Hilleary	Obey
Cardin	Hinche	Olver
Castle	Hobson	Orton
Chabot	Hoekstra	Oxley
Chambliss	Hoke	Packard
Chapman	Holden	Pallone
Christensen	Horn	Parker
Chrysler	Hostettler	Paxon
Clayton	Houghton	Payne (VA)
Clinger	Hoyer	Pelosi
Coble	Hunter	Peterson (FL)
Coburn	Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)
Coleman	Hyde	Petri
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Pomeroy
Collins (MI)	Istook	Portman
Combest	Jackson-Lee	Poshard
Condit	Jefferson	Pryce
Cooley	Johnson (CT)	Quillen
Costello	Johnson (SD)	Quinn
Cox	Johnson, E. B.	Radanovich
Coyne	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Crapo	Johnston	Ramstad
Creameans	Jones	Rangel
Cubin	Kanjorski	Reed
Cunningham	Kasich	Regula
Danner	Kelly	Richardson
de la Garza	Kennedy (MA)	Riggs
Deal	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
DeLauro	Kennelly	Roberts
DeLay	Kildee	Roemer
Dellums	Kim	Rogers
Deutsch	King	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Dickey	Kleczka	Rose
Dicks	Klink	Roth
Dixon	Klug	Roukema
Doggett	Knollenberg	Roybal-Allard
Dooley	Kolbe	Royce
Doolittle	LaHood	Salmon
Dornan	Lantos	Sanders
Doyle	Largent	Sawyer
Dreier	LaTourette	Saxton
Duncan	Laughlin	Schaefer
Dunn	Lazio	Schiff
Durbin	Lewis (CA)	Schumer

Scott	Stokes	Wamp
Seastrand	Studds	Ward
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Stupak	Watts (OK)
Shadegg	Talent	Waxman
Shaw	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Shays	Tate	Weldon (PA)
Shuster	Tauzin	Weller
Sisisky	Taylor (NC)	White
Skaggs	Thomas	Whitfield
Skeen	Thornberry	Wicker
Skelton	Thornton	Williams
Smith (MI)	Thurman	Wilson
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Wise
Smith (TX)	Torres	Wolf
Smith (WA)	Torricelli	Woolsey
Solomon	Towns	Wyden
Souder	Trafcant	Wynn
Spence	Upton	Yates
Spratt	Vucanovich	Young (AK)
Stearns	Waldholtz	Young (FL)
Stenholm	Walsh	Zeliff

NOES—59

Abercrombie	Gillmor	Payne (NJ)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pickett
Chenoweth	Gutknecht	Pombo
Clay	Hastings (FL)	Rush
Clyburn	Hayworth	Sabo
Conyers	Hefley	Sanford
Cramer	Jacobs	Scarborough
Crane	LaFalce	Schroeder
Davis	Latham	Slaughter
DeFazio	Levin	Stark
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Stockman
Meyers	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Everett	McNulty	Torkildsen
Fazio	Menendez	Velazquez
Filner	Mfume	Vento
Foglietta	Neal	Visclosky
Funderburk	Ney	Volkmer
Furse	Oberstar	Waters
Gephardt	Owens	Zimmer
Gibbons	Pastor	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—20

Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Porter
Clement	Leach	Reynolds
Collins (IL)	McHugh	Tejeda
Fattah	McIntosh	Thompson
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Tucker
Frost	Molinari	Walker
Hilliard	Ortiz	

□ 1234

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SIX-MONTH PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED TO DEAL WITH LAPSE OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order No. 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the

lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 29, 1995.

TEXT OF PROPOSED AGREEMENT
FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES AND THE
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES
OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 (b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and the Republic of South Africa Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, with accompanying annex and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Acting Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views, is also enclosed.

The proposed agreement with the Republic of South Africa has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA) and as otherwise amended. In my judgment, the proposed agreement meets all statutory requirements and will advance the non-proliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States. It provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and South Africa under appropriate conditions and controls reflecting a strong common commitment to nuclear non-proliferation goals.

The proposed new agreement will replace an existing U.S.-South Africa agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation that entered into force on August 22, 1957, and by its terms would expire on August 22, 2007. The United States suspended cooperation with South Africa under the 1957 agreement in the 1970's because of evidence that South Africa was embarked on a nuclear weapons program. Moreover, following passage of the NNPA in 1978,

South Africa did not satisfy a provision of section 128 of the Atomic Energy Act (added by the NNPA) that requires full-scope IAEA safeguards in non-nuclear weapon states such as South Africa as a condition for continued significant U.S. nuclear exports.

In July 1991 South Africa, in a momentous policy reversal, acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and promptly entered into a full-scope safeguards agreement with the IAEA as required by the Treaty. South Africa has been fully cooperative with the IAEA in carrying out its safeguards responsibilities.

Further, in March 1993 South Africa took the dramatic and candid step of revealing the existence of its past nuclear weapons program and reported that it had dismantled all of its six nuclear devices prior to its accession to the NPT. It also invited the IAEA to inspect its formerly nuclear weapons-related facilities to demonstrate the openness of its nuclear program and its genuine commitment to non-proliferation.

South Africa has also taken a number of additional important non-proliferation steps. In July 1993 it put into effect a law banning all weapons of mass destruction. In April 1995 it became a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), formally committing itself to abide by the NSG's stringent guidelines for nuclear exports. At the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference it played a decisive role in the achievement of indefinite NPT extension—a top U.S. foreign policy and national security goal.

These steps are strong and compelling evidence that South Africa is now firmly committed to stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to conducting its nuclear program for peaceful purposes only.

In view of South Africa's fundamental reorientation of its nuclear program, the United States proposes to enter into a new agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation with South Africa. Although cooperation could have been resumed under the 1957 agreement, both we and South Africa believe that it is preferable to have a new agreement completely satisfying, as the proposed new agreement does, the current legal and policy criteria of both sides, and that reflects, among other things:

- Additional international non-proliferation commitments entered into by the parties since 1974, when the old agreement was last amended, including, for South Africa, its adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;
- Reciprocity in the application of the terms and conditions of cooperation between the parties; and
- An updating of terms and conditions to take account of intervening changes in the respective domestic legal and regulatory frame-

works of the parties in the area of peaceful nuclear cooperation.

For the United States, the proposed new agreement also represents an additional instance of compliance with section 404(a) of the NNPA, which calls for an effort to renegotiate existing agreements for cooperation to include the more stringent requirements established by the NNPA.

The proposed new agreement with South Africa permits the transfer of technology, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It provides for U.S. consent rights to retransfers, enrichment, and reprocessing as required by U.S. law. It does not permit transfers of any sensitive nuclear technology, restricted data, or sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components thereof. In the event of termination, key conditions and controls continue with respect to material and equipment subject to the agreement.

From the United States perspective the proposed new agreement improves on the 1957 agreement by the addition of a number of important provisions. These include the provisions for full-scope safeguard; perpetuity of safeguards; a ban on "peaceful" nuclear explosives; a right to require the return of exported nuclear items in certain circumstances; a guarantee of adequate physical security; and a consent right to enrichment of nuclear material subject to the agreement.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123b, the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 29, 1995.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP-
PROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 232, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2126), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1995, at page H9453.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire, I understand the normal procedure is to have the time split 50-50 between the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. Is my understanding correct that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in support of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania support the conference report?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, then I ask that the time be divided three ways and I be allocated the customary 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2126, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we bring back a good conference report today. It is a bipartisan conference report providing for the national defense of our national readiness today, midterm and longterm. The total of the bill is \$243.3 billion. That is \$1.7 billion more than fiscal year 1995, but it is \$746 million less than the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, we had a very difficult conference. We had over 1,700 items in disagreement with the other body. Those complications were further complicated by a further reduction in our 602(b) allocation during the conference of \$858 million.

We were able to work out all of the issues. It required some compromise on

both sides; compromise that maybe at times was not exactly pleasant to all of us, but we managed to work out those issues and I want to thank the people that served on the subcommittee as conferees and the members of the staff for the tremendous work that was done.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to the Members on my side of the Chamber. One of the major cornerstones of our Contract With America was to revitalize our national defense, to make a change in the 11-year reduction in providing for our national defense. This bill does that.

This bill is a basic part of our Contract With America. This keeps faith with our troops. We provide quality-of-life funding in this bill above the President's budget request, such as housing allowances, and we add additional money for barracks renovation. Some of the barracks in our military were so poor, we would be ashamed to see them. We are making additional money available to correct this.

Mr. Speaker, this bill emphasizes readiness and adds over \$170 million for training shortfalls that developed because of unplanned contingencies. We add \$647 million for unfunded operations that are going on in Iraq today. This is the first time we have been up front with the taxpayer and up front with our colleagues saying we will pay for these contingency operations as they go, rather than waiting for an emergency supplemental later on.

Outside of our scope, we added \$300 million for the Coast Guard. The breast cancer provisions and funding that this House took was included in the conference report. No change.

Modernization; we were strong on modernization, not only for today but for mid-term and long-term readiness. During the hearings, we identified many, many items of shortages that were not in the budget request because they did not have a lot of political appeal. They did not really appeal to the media.

We provided money for replacing some things that were broken and to repair some things that needed to be repaired. In addition, we have a robust program for our F-15's, F-16's, F-18's and the AV-8B.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I am going to reserve the balance of my time. There are many other things we can discuss that are in the bill. It is a good bill and it deserves the support of the Members today.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the House the conference report on the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, H.R. 2126.

This conference agreement: Totals \$243.3 billion in new budget authority; it begins a revitalization of America's Armed Forces; it enhances the quality of life of our troops who have been deployed to distant lands so frequently in recent years; and it aggressively addresses current and projected modernization shortfalls.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is the culmination of a 9-month-long legislative process which we began in January with hearings on the high tempo of operations and the frequency of unbudgeted contingency operations.

Throughout the hearing process this year, we focused on the issue of "the serious shortfalls that exist in the areas of equipment, training, maintenance, and quality of life." The original House bill included funds to at least partially take care of these shortfalls. I am pleased to report that the Senate agreed with us on many of those House initiatives and thus this bill makes an important contribution to overcoming these shortfalls.

The media coverage of this bill has focused on big ticket items such as the B-2. I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that a significant portion of the initiatives taken in the conference agreement is for unglamorous but essential items such as trucks, ammunition, and communications gear.

For example, during hearings on the C-17 aircraft we found that the off-load/on-load equipment for air transport aircraft was up to 23 years old and breaking down about every 10 hours. We added money to address that problem. I could give many other examples.

CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, it was a long and arduous but highly productive conference. When the conference began we had over 1,700 items in disagreement. In the spirit of compromise there were a few instances where the House had to meet the other body half way on issues which the House felt very strongly about. However, difficult decisions must be made to produce an end product.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement provides an increase of \$6.9 billion above the budget request. But let me put that in perspective.

The procurement account requested in budget was at the lowest level in 45 years when measured in constant dollars.

Statistical and anecdotal evidence indicated that morale and readiness has been declining.

A year ago, three Army divisions declined to a C-3 readiness level, which means they had decreased flexibility, increased vulnerability, and required significant resources to offset deficiencies.

Defense manpower has declined by over 1.2 million personnel for the Active Forces, Guard and Reserve, and civilians employed by the Department since 1987.

We held innumerable hearings over many months to determine what was the appropriate funding level and program mix to reverse this steady erosion. I believe the results speak for themselves and we have produced an excellent bill.

The conferees had three main objectives in this legislation:

First, ensure that our forces remain the best fighting force in the world.

Second, proceed with a modernization program that addresses current shortfalls and provides for future security needs.

Third, ensure that we get the optimal return for the Defense expenditures by eliminating programs of marginal military value and reducing or reforming other programs which have encountered technical problems.

This legislation attains those objectives. The funding provided in this bill fulfills the constitutional obligation of the Congress to "provide for the common defense."

SUMMARY OF AGREEMENT

The conference report explains in detail the recommendations of the conferees. I will briefly highlight some of the major initiatives included in this bill:

Quality of life: We took a number of steps to enhance the quality of life of our troops. For example, we added \$322,000,000 for renovation of barracks. We approved the pay raise and increased military housing allowances for high-cost areas.

Readiness: We have been very concerned about the decline in readiness of various units. In addition to the 3 Army divisions I mentioned earlier, it should be noted that in September of 1994, 8 Marine Corps aviation squadrons were grounded for the entire month, and 28 Marine and Navy squadrons had to ground over one-half of their aircraft. There has been an enormous increase in the backlog for real property maintenance and depot maintenance. We provided an increase of \$307,000,000 for depot maintenance and \$378,000,000 for real property maintenance at operational facilities. Funds were also added for specialized skill military training.

One of the major and most important initiatives in this bill is an add-on of \$647 million above the budget for the ongoing operations in and around Iraq—for example, operations provide comfort and southern watch. Despite the fact that these operations are entering their fourth year, they have never been budgeted for by the administration. The addition of these funds ensures that other operating accounts will not be raided to fund these ongoing operations.

Modernization: The budget request for procurement for fiscal year 1996 was \$39.4 billion. This is a decline of \$96.8 billion, I repeat \$96.8 billion, from fiscal year 1985 when measured in constant dollars. The budget requested no funds to procure tanks, Air Force fighter aircraft, reconnaissance helicopters, attack helicopters, or fighting vehicles. production rates of numerous other systems are at historically low rates. For example, for the first time since the Air Force became a separate service, the budget request contained no request for tactical fighter aircraft. The research, development, test and evaluation account has also been decreasing and many key programs in research have been undergoing slippage.

To reverse this steady erosion of modernization and the industrial base, the conference agreement took a number of important steps.

In terms of major systems, funds were added to continue the production of the B-2 bomber and to build a new amphibious ship and an amphibious transport ship. We added \$100 million for acceleration of the Comanche helicopter. Programs funded at the budget request include the V-22 Osprey aircraft, and the C-17 air transport aircraft. Increases were included for the Navy's F/A-18 E/F aircraft and the Air Force's F-15E and F-16 tactical aircraft. We added \$777 million for procurement of equipment for the Guard and Reserve.

Missile Defense: The conference agreement includes a net increase of \$529 million for the ballistic missile defense programs [BMD]. The total provided for this essential program is \$3.44 billion. This expanded program accelerates both the Theater Missile Defense Program and the National Missile Defense Program, thus increasing the protection of our

troops deployed abroad as well as in the United States.

REDUCED LOWER PRIORITY PROGRAMS

The conferees made substantial reductions in programs which are of lower military value as outlined in the following table:

Program	Reduction
Technology Reinvestment Program	\$305,000,000
Energy management programs	184,600,000
Defense acquisition/management studies	164,000,000
Consultants/studies and analysis	20,700,000

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in summary I would like to point out that this conference agreement totals \$243.3 billion.

It has been a bipartisan effort in the subcommittee markup, full committee markup, and passage on the floor.

The full House has voted four times this year to support Defense funding levels above those recommended for Defense in this bill: (1) National security authorization bill; (2) national security appropriations bill; (3) House budget resolution; and (4) conference agreement on the budget resolution.

The total is within the 602(b) allocation for Defense.

This conference agreement: Enhances readiness; enhances the quality of life for our troops; deletes and or reduces funding for lower priority programs; and includes a modernization program which helps to meet the future security needs of America.

I urge support for the fiscal year 1996 Defense conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert for the RECORD a list that summarizes typographical errors in House Report 104-261, the statement of managers, accompanying this conference report. These corrections reflect agreements reached by the conferees and should be treated as such by the Department of Defense.

TYPOGRAPHICAL CORRECTIONS TO HOUSE REPORT 104-261

Page Number 52

Reads:

Total Military Personnel, Air Force +186,500 +48,323 +99,323

Should Read:

Total Military Personnel, Air Force +186,500 +48,323 +99,623

Page Number 90

Reads:

B-1B 75,393 82,593 76,283 58,483

Should Read:

B-1B 75,393 82,593 76,283 68,483

Page Number 90

Page Number 90

Last 4 lines of the table for Procurement, Marine Corps Reads:

F-15 Post Production Support	13,955	13,955	6,978
F-16 Post Production Support	194,672	94,672	158,572	126,622
Other Production Charges	167,676	167,676	188,576	187,676
DARP Support Equipment	194,374	194,374	214,374	194,374

Should be deleted from Marine Corps table and included at the end of Aircraft Procurement, Air Force table which starts at the bottom of Page 90.

Page Number 97

Reads

C-26 for the Air National Guard (2) 11,000,000

Should Read:

C-26 for the National Guard (2) 11,000,000

Page Number 98

Reads:

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard:
Information Management 29,396 59,456 44,596

Should Read:

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard:
Information Management 29,396 59,456 44,556

Reads:

Other Procurement, Army RCAS 113,134 83,174 108,174

Should Read:

Other Procurement, Army RCAS 113,134 83,174 83,174

Page 102

Reads:

Missile Technology 17,985 17,985 12,740 17,965

Should Read:

Missile Technology 17,985 17,985 12,740 17,985

Page 104

Reads: Medical Advanced Technology

Breat Cancer.

Should Read: Breast Cancer.

Reads: [. . . no later than January 15, 1995].

Should Read: [. . . no later than January 15, 1996].

Page 107

Reads:

Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology 51,816 51,816 45,170 48,483

Should Read:

Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology 51,816 51,816 45,170 48,493

Page 109

Reads:

ASW and Other Helicopter Development AH-1W -11,628 -11,628

Should Read:

ASW and Other Helicopter Development AH-1W -11,628 -11,628 -11,628

Page 117

Reads:

Strategic Environmental Research Program 58,435 58,155 58,435 58,156

Should Read:

Strategic Environmental Research Program 58,435 58,155 58,435 58,155

Reads:

Joint Advanced Strike Technology Dem/Val 30,675 30,675 18,775 30,678

Should Read:

Joint Advanced Strike Technology Dem/Val 30,675 30,675 18,775 30,675

Page 120

Reads:

Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program Maneuver UAV 36,800 16,800 36,800 28,800

Should Read:

Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program Maneuver UAV 36,800 16,800 36,800 26,800

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for working his way through a very, very difficult bill. As the gentleman mentioned, we had 1,700 areas of disagreement. Some of the major areas of disagreement were with the White House and others with the Senate.

In some, the Senate agreed with the White House, and it put us in a difficult position where we were not able to come to an agreement which satisfied everybody. Any time we have a conference report, it is obviously a compromise between all the parties.

One of the areas of particular disagreement was Bosnia. All of us have a concern about Bosnia. There is not one who has been more involved in trying to force White Houses, whether Republican or Democrat, to ask for authorization before we send peacekeeping forces to any foreign nation.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and I have been working for the last year, with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the overall committee, in trying to convince the White House that if they send peacekeepers into Bosnia, and I support them in sending forces to extract any U.N. forces who are there now if they got into trouble. I think the United States has a legitimate commitment there. I think we have a legitimate commitment on the bombing. But the peacekeeping is a different situation.

One of the most difficult tasks we can ask of our military is peacekeeping, because the way the military protects American lives is to use overwhelming force. That means in many cases we have to kill people, and we, then, become the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have gotten to the point, after 3 years of negotiation, that this administration has committed themselves to ask for authorization before we send peacekeepers into Bosnia.

□ 1245

Now, this is an important point. There are a number of people who want to vote against the conference. At this very time, we have a meeting going on at the White House where they are laying out their plans and consulting with Congress about what needs to be done in Bosnia. At the very least, the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State have both committed themselves publicly to urge the White House to come to the Congress before they commit any troops for peacekeeping in Bosnia. I think that is the way it should be. I think, not only from the process of authorization and appropriation, it is important for the support of the American people.

So we moved in that direction, and so we took the language out of our bill. The Senate said it will not want the language. It would not accept it. The White House felt we went too far. All of us understand the prerogative of the White House when it comes to dealing with national security.

I do not feel that humanitarian deployments are national security. So we think we have finally convinced this White House that, before they make this particular deployment, they are going to come to the Congress and ask for authorization. I would not be sur-

prised that as of this very time they have mentioned this to the Members of Congress who are at the meeting in the White House.

The other issues that we worked our way through, we always find areas where we have to increase the budget, decrease the budget. There are some talks about procurement being increased and readiness or O&M being decreased. The problem here is that in many cases, if we do not upgrade our equipment, we are going to run into a terrible problem in readiness. For instance, the Navy got behind the procurement of airplanes. So all the airplanes they have are slow or outdated and/or they are not stealthy. This is because they did not buy or upgrade their equipment.

So it is important, as important as individual readiness is for troops. We run into even a greater problem if we do not have technological superiority of a weapons system.

I say this is as good a bill as we can come up with, compromising with what we knew the White House rejected and what the White House did not agree to, even though I have a message here which I got 2 minutes ago which says this bill is not acceptable. I hope that if this bill passes the House, we will be able to convince the White House that they should sign the bill.

I have assurances from the Chief of Staff that he will consider it. The chairman of the committee and I both have talked to them. Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE believe that we can convince the White House at some point.

They would like to see this bill delayed, but I see no point in delaying it, since the Senate is going to delay their sending the bill down to the White House. So we worked our way through a very difficult situation, and we think we have presented as good a bill as we can present.

All of us disagree with elements in this bill. All of us would like to see some changes, but, frankly, this is as good as we could do, given the constraints we were working under in the conference itself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Pennsylvania are both strongly in support of this bill. They care very deeply about the defense posture of the United States and they know a lot about it, and I respect that. I respect their commitment to this bill, even though I happen to disagree with them.

But I have to say that I think this bill ought to go down in its present form. I do not enjoy saying that. But the fact is this bill is \$7 billion above the President's budget request. The main problem is that this bill cannot possibly result in a defense budget which will live within the budget lim-

its established by the Kasich budget, which just passed this House just a few months ago. One of the best kept secrets in this town is that, while the defense bill this year spends more money than President Clinton wants to spend, in the outyears, the Kasich budget resolution calls for a lower defense number than the President's own budget provides. Yet, this bill is so loaded up with procurement items that it cannot possibly live below that ceiling in the outyears, if we do not make some major adjustments now.

Just as a smattering of items, for instance, this bill has moved a good deal of money out of readiness and into procurement, including unnecessary purchases for B-2's, \$500 million above the President's budget on star wars. We have additional C-130's. We have a number of ships that the President did not ask for, and we have got the beginning of a huge new buy for the F-22. We simply cannot afford to buy all of those things if we are going to stay within the budget ceiling that the Kasich budget resolution establishes.

I would like to focus the remainder of my remarks on the motion to recommit, which I expect to offer at the end of this debate today. The taxpayers in my State, and I think around the country, are outraged by reports that over the last several months the bosses in the Pentagon have gotten together with the bosses the defense industry to cook up a scheme to stick the taxpayers with a huge bill for corporate welfare.

The Pentagon has agreed to pay millions of tax dollars to 460 executives affected by the merger of two defense contractors, Lockheed and Martin Marietta. That reported plan is to hold up the taxpayers for \$31 million out of a \$92 million golden parachute deal. In fact, one of the gentlemen involved, one of the gentleman who will receive those nice benefits will receive over \$8 million, a good portion of that right out of the pockets of the taxpayer.

In the meantime, Lockheed/Martin expects to fire a total of 30,000 workers over 18 months. Where are their good-bye Christmas presents in comparison to what is happening to these executives? Under our system, if these private corporations choose to waste their private funds in this fashion, I guess it is all right with me, although I question it; but I certainly do not see why the taxpayers ought to have to pay one-third of the deal.

I think it is especially ironic that some of the same budgeteers who would have us gut programs to educate our kids, to take care of our senior citizens, to retrain the very workers who are being fired in these mergers, they do not even bat an eye when their corporate friends cook up these cozy deals for their multi-million-dollar handout.

Now, what happened is that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] offered language in the House floor which tried to fix the problem. The

committee accepted that language. But then the legal beagles down at the Pentagon sent us a note telling us that they had found a way to get around it. They will try to find a way to get around virtually everything we send them. But my motion to recommit will, if adopted by the House, fix the problem so that they cannot get around it. It will see to it that, if they want to provide those golden parachutes for those executives, they do it out of their own profits, that they do not do it out of the deficit-laden budget of the United States at the expense of the taxpayers.

There should not be this \$31 million giveaway in this bill. So I would urge, when the time comes, that Members vote for the motion to recommit. I would urge that Members vote against the conference report because this bill does not live up to the fiscal promises made just 4 months ago in this House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, I disagree with the gentleman who just spoke. This does live up to the budgetary agreements that this House agreed to earlier this year. As a matter of fact, we are below those numbers.

On the issue of the motion to recommit that the gentleman mentioned, we supported the Sanders language in the conference not only the language but the intent. In the conference, I thought it was only fair to tell the members of the conference committee of the memorandum from the Pentagon. At the time I made the point, I did not believe that it was a legal opinion, that it was merely an opinion from someone in the Pentagon. But we support the Sanders language. We are prepared to establish by colloquy the intent of the Sanders language. But I do not think that is a good reason to recommit this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a very distinguished member of the subcommittee and of the conference committee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking member, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], our fine chairman, for I do not think there are any two Members that are more committed and focused to getting a job done. When we have 1700 disagreements in conference and can work through those in a matter of 3 or 4 days, that is highly commendable.

This bill ensures our military men and women will remain ready, prepared and second to none on this planet.

I would strongly urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote for this very important bill. Unfortunately, the fog of misinformation has obscured the benefits of this bill and led some to consider opposing it. Let me lift the fog and make clear what is fact and what is fiction.

It has been alleged that this bill provides for taxpayer funding of abortions.

That is not true. That is not true. The fact is that taxpayer dollars do not pay for abortions at DOD facilities. The fact is the bill reaffirms the role of authorizing committees in determining policy and prohibits abortions at DOD facilities if the authorizing committees endorse that action.

Folks, if we care about a person's right to life, we will care about the lives of our fighting men and women stationed all over the world because we will care about the weapons and the training and all of the things that are provided for in this bill that helps our people stay alive in military installations around this world.

It has been alleged that this bill provides a green light for American military intervention in Bosnia. Once again, not true. Congress will vote on any deployment of our military and voting against this bill will only ensure that if Americans come under fire they may not be prepared and they may in fact be at risk. These are the facts.

It has been alleged that this bill contains pork barrel projects. This is also not true. Members may argue with some of the policy choices made in this bill, but these choices are not pork. This bill contains funding to ensure America's military remains second to none. Every dollar in this bill can be justified by military need. Although some may disagree on the need for a strong military, that is a policy disagreement, not an issue of pork barrel spending.

These are the facts, let us put aside arguments based on fiction. The facts are simple. The Federal Government has one obligation for which it is solely responsible, defending the shores and territory of the United States and opposing our enemies on foreign soil. As elected representatives, our primary responsibility must always be our Nation's security. A no vote against this bill abdicates the responsibility and fails the American people. That is a fact. Any other view is fiction.

Our decision should be simple, support the facts, ensure a secure America, vote yes and in support of the defense appropriations bill.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the young men and young women in uniform today. I speak for this Department of Defense appropriations bill. I think that this bill makes a major step in the right direction to help restore the needed dollars that have been slowly slipping away through the years.

I say to my colleagues that we have the finest young men and women in uniform that we have ever had. I know this by personal observation, by meeting with them, by speaking with them at their posts, at their bases, here in this country and, yes, in other parts of the world. It is up to us, under the Constitution of the United States, Article I, Section 8, to support the military, the Armed Forces. That is what we are

doing today. If we fail to do so properly today, shame on us because we will be letting those young men and those young women down who we have a constitutional duty to support.

This is a step in the right direction. I am pleased because it is a strong bill for our forces. The bill only increases Department of Defense spending over 1995 by \$1.7 billion. It does cut O&M, but it still remains over the President's recommendation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I had my own military budget which was in excess of this that I had been working on for quite some time.

□ 1300

If this does not meet my expectations of what we need, this is still a very, very dangerous and uncertain world in the kaleidoscope of history and what is to come in the future. We must remain strong, and this bill is a step in that right direction, though it does have compromises in it, and frankly I personally would have more dollars than it has.

To be sure, Mr. Speaker, there are philosophical differences in this bill, and, if I had my druthers, I would add funding to parts of it, and I might cut in other areas. But we must make sure that we keep the young men and young women strong, that we have enough ammunition for them, that we take care of their families, that we pay them properly, which is so important, and that we do all that we can to stand behind them in the arduous days ahead.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke about the possibility of our troops going into Bosnia. Of course I think we should have a very substantial and substantive debate on that issue right here in this hall, right here in this Chamber. But if that does come to pass, we want them to be well equipped, we want them to be well maintained, we want them to be well trained. If we do not pass this bill, there is a dire consequence that might come to pass, and that is they will not be ready, they will not be supplied with proper maintenance, ammunition, and they might not be well trained.

Something has been said about the pro-life issue on this bill, and for the first time in the conference report there is positive language, positive language in the area of pro-life. I am personally pro-life, and I think that those managers on our part should be complimented for taking that step, but, if my colleagues really want to be pro-life, let us provide enough funding for the young men and young women who are to go into harm's way so that they will have the adequate training, the adequate maintenance, and the adequate equipment to protect themselves, and to do their duty, and to do their job, arduous and difficult as that duty is. That is our job, to stand behind them.

Mr. Speaker, let us fulfill our constitutional duty. Being the superpower

in this world, we must do this. We must pass this bill.

I compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for an excellent job on this. I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking Democrat, for a fine job on this, and I have worked with him for these many years. I will support this bill. It is a giant step in the right direction, and I hope this House will pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], for their strong support of my amendment in the defense appropriations bill which would end Pentagon financial support for golden handshakes for top management when large defense contractors merge. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] accepted that amendment. It was passed on a voice vote, and I am very appreciative to them for that support. I am also grateful that the Senate conferees accepted this amendment and it remains in the bill that we are voting upon today.

There is honest disagreement within this body as to how much money should be appropriated for the defense purposes this coming year. That is an important debate. There should not be, however, and I do not believe that there is, any disagreement that all of the money that we appropriate for defense should go for defense, go to providing the weapons and equipment our fighting men and women need; that is where all of us want defense money to go.

As my colleagues know, the purpose of my amendment was to make sure that, if and when large defense contractors merge, no U.S. taxpayer money was to go to the CEO or top executives who negotiated those mergers, no golden handshakes from the U.S. taxpayer. As everyone knows, huge mergers are taking place every day. Whether they are good or bad is subject for another discussion. But what is relevant today is that no taxpayer dollars should be provided to millionaire executives in the defense industry as incentives to develop those mergers.

My amendment was prompted by an outrage that many of my colleagues are familiar with. In February of this year Martin Marietta Corporation merged with Lockheed. That merger triggered a previously established plan which provides \$92 million in bonuses, \$92 million in bonuses to the CEO, the board of directors, and the top-level managers of those two companies, \$92 million. What is particularly outrageous is that as part of that plan and

part of the bonuses that same plan called for the closing of 12 factories and laboratories and the laying off of 19,000 American workers. In other words, while 19,000 workers were tossed out on the street, the top executives were paid \$92 million. They were paying \$92 million to themselves.

This is an outrage, but what is an even greater outrage is that of that \$92 million, \$31 million came from the Pentagon from the U.S. taxpayers, and that, fellow colleagues, we must not allow to happen.

Within the secret agreement negotiated between the Pentagon and the two companies we found out exactly where the money has gone, and some of that information had already been published. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the President of Lockheed Martin, Norm Augustine, will receive over \$8 million in bonuses; Lamar Alexander, a member of the board of Martin Marietta, will receive \$236,000; Melvin Laird, former Secretary of Defense, would receive \$1.6 million; retired general and former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Vessey, would receive \$372,000.

Now the problem is, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] indicated, in the conference process the Pentagon walked in with a piece of paper, and they said, well, the language might not be clear enough to stop these bonuses going to the Lockheed Martin executives despite the clear intent that was passed in this body. The purpose of the language that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will present is to lock it up, absolutely clearly, that the intent of the amendment was to stop the bonuses going to those executives, an outrageous example of corporate welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of Mr. OBEY's motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for the time.

My colleagues, when I want to make a point to Democrats, I come stand at this mike. I do not want to stand here today. I want to go over here, and I want to speak to the Republican side of the aisle because I am upset.

Let me tell my colleagues something. I have heard some young Republicans come over here, and they say they are going to vote against this bill because they are worried about body bags, and I have heard others come over here and say they are going to vote against this bill because there is too much money in it.

Now I am going to tell my young fellows and friends something. I was at a Marine Corps League meeting the other night with generals, and colonels, and captains, and enlisted men, and, to a man and woman, they wanted us to vote for this bill.

Why?

As my colleagues know, when we formed this Republic of States some 219 years ago, we did it for the primary purpose of providing a common defense and if we are going to put young men and women in harm's way in the military, we are going to give them the very best.

This is an appropriations bill. We are not supposed to be legislating in an appropriations bill—things like Bosnia body bags, things like abortion. I am a pro-lifer and for 18 years have stood here and voted that pro-life line. But that is not what this is about. We have got increases in this bill of 9, 10 and 11 percent for manpower, for readiness and for research and development that will give our men and women the best state-of-the-art weaponry we can.

Let me tell my colleagues and some of the younger Members who think they are going to come over here and vote against this thing because it has not got some body-bag language in it: You come over here, and you vote for this bill because every single man and woman serving in the military today wants you to. They know what's best for them. They know better than you do. And if you've never set foot in a military base in this country or overseas, go and ask them.

I wish we had more time to discuss this, but I am going to tell my colleagues something. Our country depends on it. If we let this bill go down, it will come back here, and it will not have the 8, 9, 10, and 11-percent increases in there. We will get shafted. That is why we must pass this bill now today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I think I just heard the gentleman say we were not supposed to attach legislative language to appropriations bills. Labor-HEW is tied up because we have a bundle of legislative language attached to that bill from their side of the aisle. Treasury-Post Office is tied up because we have got a disagreement about legislative language. We have got 30 pages out of a 90-page EPA appropriation bill that has legislative language.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say Members on their side of the aisle who are concerned about seeing activity on that question are right.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

(Mr. HOBSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the subcommittee and a member of the conference committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to rise in support of this very, very important bill and to

say to my colleagues that I have never seen a finer piece of work done on the appropriation defense bill than done by my chairman and his colleague, the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. It is a very, very difficult bill. It is very important to the country. It is a bill that could very well be disrupted because of some of the language that may or may not be in the bill.

A change in pattern relative to this bill; that is not what we have done in the past in terms of the appropriations process. There are places to handle policy issues that are extraneous in other bills. It is absolutely unacceptable to find ourselves in a position of putting appropriations to funding for our national defense systems in jeopardy because of people's largely single-issue interests. To me I think it is critical that the Members know that this bill will become worse if we go forward from here without passing it today.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Do not mistake the metaphorical quality of my next statements for its lack of theological basis. St. Peter on my judgment day will not ask me about the B-2 or my defense votes. He will ask me about my vote to protect innocent human life. The doctors in our military do not want to perform abortions, and for those who may not be aware of the history, there has been a pro-life rider on the appropriations bill in 1979, 1980, and 1981, and I believe the years on either side of that, but I found the documentation on that.

□ 1315

I think this is an excellent defense bill, but I have never seen a devil's deal like this since I was sworn in here in 1977. To tell me who flew the B-2, and I mean flew it, radio calls, takeoff, the entire flight, and two grease job landings, if I may say so. I want that system to defend our country. It may save lives in the dead of night. But 1½ million babies being killed should not include military hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" with a heavy heart.

The \$100 million cut by the House from the recruiting and advertising budget was restored.

Several Senate initiatives to liberalize the medical insurance program for military dependents (called CHAMPUS) were incorporated by conferees. But the report included the same general ban on the funding of abortions as that contained in the first fiscal 1981 continuing appropriations resolution (PL 96-369). PL 96-369 provided emergency funding for government departments whose regular funding bills had not been cleared by Congress as of the start of fiscal 1981. Also retained was a Senate provision authorizing a test of commercial health maintenance organizations as a substitute for CHAMPUS. (Continuing appropriations resolution, p. 168; CHAMPUS authorization legislation, see National Security chapter, p. 91).

OTHER PROVISIONS

The conferees also agreed to provisions that would: Ban abortions with appropriated funds except where the life of the mother would otherwise be endangered or in cases of rape or incest that were reported to a law enforcement agency or public health service.

MEDICAL CARE AND ABORTIONS

On a point of order, a committee provision was thrown out that would have limited reimbursement by CHAMPUS to not more than the 80th percentile of customary medical charges for comparable services.

By a vote of 226-163, the House adopted an amendment by Robert K. Dornan, R-Calif., that would bar use of funds in the bill to pay for any abortion not required to save the life of the mother. The amendment contained the same limitation that the House earlier had placed on funds appropriated to the Health, Education and Welfare Department. Between Sept. 1, 1976, and Sept. 1, 1977, about 26,500 abortions were performed in military hospitals or paid for by CHAMPUS. (Vote 584, p. 166-H)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. He and I and many members of this conference committee are all pro-life voters, 100 percent. This bill provides the Dornan language with a caveat. We did not particularly want to accept that caveat, but we were in conference and were put in a position of having to accept the caveat, but we did maintain the Dornan language.

Now, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], that we had the same problem in our conference that he has in the conference that he is a member of, and his conference is basically deadlocked over this issue. We could not afford to deadlock because we had the end of the fiscal year approaching us, and that is, of course, the end of the fiscal year, September 30. So we did not do as much as the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] wanted, but we did more than has been done for a long time on the issue of abortion on this bill. I think those of us who are pro-life can say we got a partial victory, not everything we wanted, but a partial victory.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to talk a little bit about something here, the advance agreement regarding the costs allowability of benefits due to the change of control, as defined in the various plans.

Did your eyes glaze over yet, colleagues? Well, that is the idea. They are trying to put Members to sleep here, because they are trying to pull a fast one on the American taxpayer. What that language means and what this agreement says is that the U.S. Government, its U.S. taxpayers, are going to give golden parachutes to executives of failing defense contractors.

Can you believe that? There is going to be a \$92 million golden parachute to the directors of Martin Marietta.

Now, that might be OK if it was coming from the stockholders. But one-third of that money, \$31 million, is coming from the U.S. taxpayer. Somehow it is in the interests of the defense of the United States, somehow it is in the interests of the taxpayers, that we should pay the directors of a failing corporation who have merged with another corporation a subsidy.

Lamar Alexander, Republican candidate for President of the United States, the guy in the flannel shirt, the ordinary guy, he is going to get \$236,000 for merging these two companies together, \$80,000 of that paid by the U.S. taxpayers.

I do not believe anybody thinks that is right. The president of the firm is going to get \$9.2 million for merging his firm with another, putting 30,000 skilled Americans out of work, who do not get so much as a thank you or a golden watch, let alone a golden parachute. One-third of his bonus for doing this, \$3 million, will be paid by the Department of Defense, by the taxpayers of the United States of America, unless this motion to recommit is approved.

Now, everything goes on around here with a wink and a nod. This language was approved unanimously by the House of Representatives, and now they are trying to pull it out.

Mr. Speaker, vote "aye" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must have misspoke. We are not trying to change the language. The language you offered is exactly the language accepted in the conference.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is not, in effect.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the language the gentleman offered is the exact language that we agreed to on the floor and that the conference agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is absolutely right, that the same language remains, and I thank him and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for supporting that language. But here is the problem that we have: As the gentleman knows better than I do, during the conference committee the Pentagon comes trotting down and says "Well, maybe that language won't work in stopping this outrageous series of bonuses to these executives." What we are trying to do now is bring in firm language that will work.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we hope we will be able to do this. We do not think it is necessary to recommit the bill in order to do it.

We agree with the thrust of what the gentleman was trying to do and the amendment that the gentleman offered.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of the subcommittee and a member of the conference.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman YOUNG for his outstanding efforts, and thank Congressman MURTHA and all the subcommittee members for their strong support.

And our Defense Subcommittee staff led by Kevin Roper deserves special recognition for a job well done.

I know this is a tough vote for many Members. It is a tough vote for me—I have a 100-percent pro-life voting record since coming to Congress in 1977, and I am committed to standing firm with my colleagues in the pro-life community on the abortion issue on our other appropriations bills.

But I am supporting this conference agreement because the defense of our country is also critical, and because this Defense bill is the only one that has a chance to be signed into law, and because those who are thinking it will get any better by sending this bill back to conference are wrong.

Yes, we have provided funding increases in this bill—but they are increases above the President's original budget request.

They are increases to meet the highest priority shortfalls as identified by the Department of Defense such as \$322 million for the renovation of barracks and \$700 million for real property maintenance—critical quality of life issues.

The increases we provided above the President's request for shipbuilding, F-15's, F-16's, Navy aircraft, and tanks are all in the Defense Department's 5-year program.

We funded these programs now because the weapons modernization and procurement programs have been cut 70 percent since 1985.

The modest increases, and policy direction, we provide in missile defense will for the first time allow us to actually deploy effective missile defenses for our troops and citizens beginning in the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, these successes will be reversed if we do not pass this conference agreement today.

And to those who say we provide too much for defense, the \$243 billion provided in this conference agreement is the same level as last year's Defense appropriations bill that was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by our President.

While this bill provides an increase over the President's budget, it still represents a decrease in real terms—inflation, et cetera—for the 11th consecutive year. For the last 11 years defense has been cut 35 percent in real terms.

Defense has contributed approximately \$140 billion to deficit reduction since 1985—the largest contributor.

Despite the rhetoric you constantly hear about cuts in domestic programs, until this

year non-defense domestic discretionary spending, since 1985, has increased in inflation adjusted outlay dollars by 28 percent. [Source is President's own fiscal year 1996 budget submission.]

Means tested entitlement spending over the same period has increased, when adjusted for inflation, by 38 percent. If you do not adjust for inflation, entitlements since 1985 have at least doubled or increased by over 100 percent.

Even under the Republican budget resolution we just slow the increase in domestic spending by reducing the annual growth rate in Federal spending to 3 percent.

Under the Republican budget, Medicare spending still increases by 6.4 percent a year.

Even with the slow down in non-defense domestic discretionary spending we have already provided in fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills: Plus \$255 billion in discretionary and mandatory spending in the Labor/HHS Ed fiscal year 1996 bill, this Defense bill is \$243 billion.

Another \$11.6 billion in feeding programs in the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, including \$3.7 billion for WIC—\$259.8 million over 1995 levels—and \$4.4 billion for the School Lunch Program.

Some \$37.3 billion for veterans' programs in the fiscal year 1996 VA/HUD bill. Of this amount \$16.9 billion is for veterans' medical care programs, an increase of over \$740 million from 1995 levels.

In WIC, school lunch, veterans' programs, student loans—no one currently receiving services is taken off the rolls or dropped out of the programs.

Yet, we ignore that with 11 consecutive years of cuts in real terms in Defense spending, 1.1 million Defense personnel have been dropped off the rolls—lost jobs—since 1987. Fifteen thousand people per month are losing civilian and military jobs in the Defense Department during this fiscal year.

Private sector job losses in the defense industry are estimated to be over 1 million since 1990 alone.

Remember, 64 percent of last year's DOD appropriations bill was for personnel and operations; 62 percent of this bill goes just for personnel and operations.

This bill simply puts a finger in the dike, and, if we do not pass this one it is only going to get worse.

Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted that what just transpired happened as I was about to come up here, because it highlights the problem. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] have done a wonderful job with this bill. All of the members of the committee and subcommittee have done a wonderful job with the bill. There were differences, real differences, pounded out between the House and the Senate. And yet we get a communication from the White House dated today from Alice Rivlin, Director of OMB, that says the President is going to veto the bill; too much spending. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is going to vote against the bill; too much spending. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] spoke against the bill. He does not know why. He may be wrong about the bill, but he is against it.

Then we have Republican freshmen who sent out "Dear Colleagues," and they are against it. They are against it for all sorts of reasons. Some are valid, some are not. Some say they funded the *Seawolf*. It did not matter that the Speaker and the whole northeastern establishment and the Navy all say that we need the *Seawolf*. But they are against it. They say there is too much defense conversion.

The reason the Senate insisted on the defense conversion under the TRP program, whatever that stands for, remain in, was to satisfy the President; \$175 million to satisfy the President, because, after all, they said if it is in, he will not veto it. But here it says the President is going to veto it. He is against it.

Some of our freshmen are against the fact that we are not tying the President's hands on Bosnia. We do not have language in here that says, unconstitutionally I might add, that the President, no matter what happens in Bosnia between now and the end of this next fiscal year, no matter how good the solution looks, we cannot put one troop on the ground or otherwise we are in violation of their concerns. That is preemptive. That is bad foreign policy. Basically what they seek to do is say that the President of the United States, the Commander In Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, cannot act to make this a more peaceful world. They are wrong, but they are against this bill.

Then we get the right-to-life groups. I am 100 percent a pro-lifer. I believe in the sanctity of human life. But I also believe that we as Members of Congress have the right to negotiate, to debate, to compromise and come to what we believe to be in the best interests of the future of the United States and all of our citizens, and I am not going to let that one issue come between me and protecting my constituents.

This is a good bill. You can find many reasons to be against it. But if you vote against it, you are voting against the future of the United States in derogation of your responsibilities to the people of the United States, whom you are charged to represent, and I say that you are wrong.

In that event, with no further screaming or yelling, in the calm of day, I would urge all of my colleagues, no matter what their reason for being against this bill, to reflect on one thing: If Members defeat this conference report, and if Members believe that we need to provide for a strong national defense, when the bill comes back, it will not provide as well as this bill does. It will be worse when it comes back, and Members will have shot themselves in the foot.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote for this conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1¼ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House know, the gentleman from Louisiana and I are very good friends. But

I have to say that I think he misdescribes what our responsibilities are to the people of this country. In my view, our responsibilities are not exempted from the squeeze that is being applied to everybody else.

This bill does not meet that test. It does not even allow us over time to stay within the Republican budget that was passed with overwhelming Republican unity in this House just a few months ago. Because with all of the weapons systems piled into this bill, they will be forcing spending far in excess of the Kasich budget.

We also have a responsibility to see to it that the Congress of the United States does not embarrass itself by giveaways to corporations in the process of providing a defense bill. This bill also does not meet that test, and so the bill ought to go down until those two items are corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, I have been trying to think of a good name for this bill, and I heard it from that side of the aisle. This bill is a piece of work. This bill is a piece of work that goes right after readiness. I sit on the Committee on National Security and I have sat there for 23 years, and for the last year all we have heard about is "hollow force, hollow force, hollow force. Clinton let them have a follow force." Guess what? They raided the readiness funds we put in there, and so I guess they decided maybe they like the hollow force, they said it so many times, because this bill is less in readiness than Clinton's bill.

It is \$7 billion more than the Pentagon asked for. Imagine. We did not even do that during the cold war. It is really just a wonderful goodie package for all the defense contractors. We have loaded in all of these wonderful goodies and corporate benefits that the Defense Department did not ask for. They did not ask for B-2's, they did not ask for all of this.

And if you look at the funny, fuzzy accounting in here, which Alice Rivlin has and has sent us a letter, it is very troubling, because I think it is even way over the \$7 billion, because they played with the inflation fund. I guess they do not think inflation is going to be what DOD thinks it is, and on and on and on.

But I must say, for all of that, I am even more troubled by a letter that was sent to the President by the chairman apparently and the ranking member. If I can just quote two lines out of this, I think this is devastating. They are saying, "As a consequence, therefore we cannot fathom why a bill such as this is being considered for a presidential veto." They say it becomes

even more troubling at a time when demands on our Armed Forces appear to be on the rise when you are talking about a negotiated settlement in Bosnia.

That sounds to me like a deal is cut. Hey, let us have all the weapons, and we will let you have whatever you want in Bosnia. I think that is troubling, and I think that is what is bothering an awful lot of people in this Chamber.

Vote aye on recommittal and vote no on the bill.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points that I think are important. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made the recommendation in the subcommittee that we eliminate the language on Bosnia. He felt it was very important, because the White House was objecting to that language. I, on the other hand, had a great concern about eliminating the language.

Now, since that time we have got a commitment from the White House, I believe, to come to us for authorization and appropriation of money before they commit troops to Bosnia. So I think it is not a good characterization. I think he can be rightly upset because we thought this took care of one of the problems that would help us keep the bill from being vetoed.

I still do not believe the President will veto this bill, if we work our way down the road. We are hopeful that the changes we made in raising TRP, in making a compromise on Nunn-Lugar, by eliminating the Bosnia language, we hope that we will be able to get a bill through.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my concern was the letter from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG]. The way I really read this three-page letter, it basically says to the President, if you veto this bill, then we will not be positive about Bosnia. First of all, I think that is inappropriate to say to the Commander in Chief.

□ 1330

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The fact is that that was a misinterpretation of our intent. Our intent is to say that we are providing what we believe to be the modicum needs for the Armed Forces of the United States. If the President makes an incursion into Bosnia, he is going to be expected to spend anywhere from \$3 to \$4 billion. I would ask the President to tell us

where the money is coming from and what does he want us to do, and maybe we can work it out. But do not veto this bill and expect to get less and then want us to go into Bosnia. That does not make sense.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think we have gotten the message across to the White House. I think the compromise we have made on this issue they recognize, and I think the Congress will have a very important role.

The fact they are meeting right now to consult with the Congress is a very important part of this overall solution to this problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire how much time is remaining on all three sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 3¼ minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has 5½ minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], a strong pro-life and a strong defense supporter.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to take my colleagues on this side of the aisle back to 1 year ago this week when we gathered in front of the Capitol to sign the Contract With America. One of the basic tenets of the contract was to ensure a strong national defense for our country. This bill for the first time in years moves us toward this fundamental goal and deserves an "aye" vote.

I also want to address the abortion issue that has been of concern to many of my colleagues. I have a strong pro-life record on abortion and a strong philosophical belief in the preservation of life. I've voted in committee and on the floor for an amendment to prohibit abortions in military hospitals abroad. While I continue to support this issue, we shouldn't kill this bill on this issue. We have increased procurement, research, and quality of life accounts in this bill while reducing spending on nondefense items. This is a good bill that prodefense members should support.

I urge an "aye" vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has the right to close, then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and that he be permitted to control that time so that he will have 5 minutes to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume,

and I would like to say, in closing our argument. I do think that we did the best we could do on this bill. Let me say to the pro-life people, I resisted tremendous pressure from the Democratic side several years ago to put language in the bill which would have allowed abortions overseas. We did not put that language in our bill because we thought that would be inappropriate. We thought the pro-life position was the right position and we resisted that position.

I would hope the Members would take that into consideration. It sounds like we need a medic here to save this bill because everybody is talking negative. I think we have a good bill. I think we have a bill that is as good as we can get, and I hope we will be able to convince the White House to sign the bill when it finally gets to them. I would urge the Members to vote for a reasonable defense bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

This is a very, very difficult position, I think, for many of us on the pro-life side to be in. Let me make it very clear why many pro-life Members of Congress oppose this conference report. We do not contend that supporters of the report are necessarily pro-abortion. Indeed, the opposite is true: the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member are very pro-life. But sadly, the fact of the matter is that this is a pro-abortion bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House voted to prohibit abortions in our military hospitals. The conference report will allow abortions in these hospitals for any reason whatsoever without limitation. Members of Congress who ordinarily vote against abortion can support this legislation if, and only if, they have not read the language carefully or, perhaps, if they have other priorities that come before the unborn child.

How important are the lives of these children that would be put at risk if this conference report were to be enacted into law? If your life or mine, I say to my friends, if your life or mine were at risk or in jeopardy of being either chemically poisoned or killed by a dismemberment, or by a suction machine, would voting down this conference report be so difficult to do?

I would suggest and submit that we all know that eventually a conference report will be passed, or perhaps as part of a CR we will fund the Department of Defense. It is a matter of when. It is not a matter of if.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out to Members that the Dornan language is carried over in this bill, but then there is gutting language. One person referred to it as a "caveat." It completely and totally negates the operative section of the Dornan language.

Let me also remind Members that all of the pro-life groups—the Christian Coalition, the National Right to Life Committee—reluctantly but, nevertheless firmly, have come down and asked for a no vote on this DOD conference report.

It is a very difficult situation for all of us to be in. I do not like it, nobody likes it, but if we want to save the unborn, if we want to save them from the cruelty of abortion, a no vote is the only way to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 1¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has one speaker remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that I think Members have given ample reason for opposing the bill in general. I would also urge that they support the motion to recommit for the simple reason that it prevents a \$31 million ripoff of the taxpayers to the United States, a ripoff which will enrich a few corporate directors while the workers of that same company are being laid off.

I do not think that is a proposition any of us can go home and explain to any of our constituents, and I do not think we should even try. So I would urge the adoption of the recommittal motion and the defeat of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 698]

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder

Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chryslers
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox

Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett

Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham

LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs

Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1408

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). On this rollcall, 403 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my being involved in an event at the White House prevented me from voting on rollcall No. 698, a quorum call. Had I been able to vote I would have voted "present."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if this bill goes down, what does he think the next one is going to look like?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the problem, as I see it, is, we had over 2000 suggestions and recommendations to the bill. Obviously, we had to make a judgment on each of those recommendations as we went through the bill. Certainly, it would be a problem because as it gets involved in negotiations, there will be less of everything available. So there is no question in my mind, that there will be some substantial changes in the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. There was some clapping when the gentleman said that. Some Members believe that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said is a good thing. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] spoke against the bill. He thinks that there is too much spending. The gentleman, various other folks on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle have spoken against the bill for various reasons.

We got a letter here from Alice Rivlin, dated today, saying the President of the United States is going to veto this bill because it is too much spending. I know that that represents a large sentiment in the minority, the minority.

My colleagues, I address these comments to my friends on this side, we are the majority. We have been elected to set the agenda. One of the planks in the Contract With America was to provide for a strong national defense.

Now, there are those among us who came to Congress with one issue or two issues in mind that had nothing whatsoever to do with the strong national defense. And I agree with them on those issues. Some want to balance the budget. Some believe that the protection of innocent life is the most important thing in this world. I agree with them. I have got a 100 percent pro-life record. But I also think that we as elected Members of the House of Representatives have the responsibility to represent our mutual constituents. We have the responsibility of representing every live: man, woman and child in our districts, every man, woman and child in America. Under the Constitution of the United States, one of our primary, if not our primary, responsibilities is to provide for an adequate defense for this Nation.

The House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations have met in conference and we have produced a conference report in bipartisan fashion which provides for not only an adequate defense but for a better defense than the President of the United States was prepared to provide if his numbers had governed.

Last year in the rose garden in front of the White House, the President of the United States, surrounded by people with medals of all sorts, his Joint Chiefs of Staff, said his plan to reduce the military, the pentagon, had gone so far that he was \$25 billion short, short in his plans to protect the sanctity of the United States to provide for the national defense. And, therefore, he was going to recommend that we spend \$25 billion more.

Guess what? The check never arrived. It never came. In his budget proposal in February, he provided for spending on defense of \$7 billion less than last year, \$7 billion less than last year.

This conference committee, in conjunction with the Senate, said, no, Mr. President. We are going to hold you to your promise. We are going to provide exactly, not more, not less, but exactly what we provided last year. We are going to stem the flow. We realize that defense has been the scapegoat for every domestic program on earth for 11 straight years, that for the last 11 years procurement has gone down by almost 75 percent, that in real terms, spending on defense has gone down by nearly 30 percent, and that it is time to stand up for the young men and women in uniform in this country and provide the basic services, the basic maintenance, the basic operations, the basic training that they need to do their job.

□ 1415

Now the President of the United States, the President of the United States, may well come to us in a few weeks and say he wants to send 25,000, or any number, of troops to Bosnia, and some of my colleagues want to put a preemption in there and say, "No, Mr. President, you can't do that." I suggest to my colleagues that we can do that,

that he must come to Congress, that he cannot ignore us, but to take the unheard-of-step, unconstitutional step, of binding him before he has taken that action, is to play in the hands of the foolish of the world who believe that it is in the best interest of the pacifists of the world to simply bind the President in future events. How in the world can we really seriously say that no matter what happens in this world, no matter how much more peaceful in this world the President can make Europe by helping Bosnia, that we are going to cut it off today without knowing what is going to happen tomorrow and that under no circumstances can we put 10 troops in Bosnia, let alone 25,000?

Let us cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us not unconstitutionally bind the President of the United States. Let us pass a good defense bill, even with last year. Let us not get hung up on pro-life issues that are important to all of us who are pro-life, but let us not forget that our first responsibility is to provide for an adequate national defense for every man, woman, and child in America today.

This is a good bill. Pass it.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I stand before this House and offer a pledge of allegiance. However, unlike the pledge we take each morning, this pledge of allegiance is to those who are not yet born.

Simply said, I pledge allegiance to the right to life.

My belief in the right to life is not debatable, it is not contestable, it is not even open to discussion. It is an issue that simply offers no compromise and yet, today we face a dilemma.

That dilemma surrounds our vote on the 1996 Department of Defense Appropriations Act conference report. That report contains a provision that prohibits funds from being made available to perform abortions at DOD medical facilities only if specifically authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act. The Appropriations Committee has now placed a burden of responsibility squarely on the shoulders of those on the authorization committee.

Well, I accept that responsibility. And as I cast my vote for the appropriations conference report, I clearly understand that I must work hard to make certain the 1996 DOD authorization language directs that those facilities will not be used for abortions. At the same time, a vote for the appropriations conference report is a vote of support for our national defense and the needs of our Nation's military.

The correct forum to fight the battle against performing abortions in DOD facilities is in the authorization conference committee. As such, I encourage my colleagues to support the appropriations conference report.

Vote today for the conference report but I implore each and everyone in this chamber to support the design of language that prohibits this unacceptable procedure in our 1996 Defense Authorization Act.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the conference report accompanying H.R. 2126, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. My colleagues, this conference agreement appropriates a total of \$243.3 billion for defense programs—\$6.9 billion more than the administration's request

and \$1.7 billion more than was appropriated in fiscal year 1995.

When combined with the monies appropriated under the defense-related provisions in the energy and water appropriations bill and those provided by the military construction appropriations bill, the total amount appropriated by the House of Representatives during fiscal year 1996 for Defense programs will be \$264.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I support a level of defense spending adequate to meet our legitimate national security needs. However, when we spend billions of dollars on elaborate new weapons systems, millions of Americans go without health care insurance, decent housing, and an opportunity to seek a higher education.

During the last several months, we have seen funding levels slashed for environmental and health protections, student loans, school lunches, Medicare, and numerous other governmental programs which make up the social welfare safety net. Increasing the funding levels for the Department of Defense while inflicting painful cuts on every other item in the Federal budget is both inequitable and harmful to our overall strength as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this conference agreement. This conference agreement offers only a grand illusion of greater national security. Vote "no" on the conference report.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1996 Defense appropriations conference report.

This agreement provides \$243 billion for the Department of Defense including \$69 billion for military personnel, \$81.5 billion for operation and maintenance, and \$44.4 billion for procurement. Total funding is \$746 million less than the House-passed bill and \$1.7 billion more than enacted in fiscal year 1995.

As the No. 2 member of the Budget Committee, I can confirm that the Defense appropriations conference report is in line with the balanced budget priorities we established in the budget resolution. There should be no fiscal objection to this conference agreement. It is one which everybody can support.

As a member of the conference committee, I can attest that the House conferees stood up for the priorities established in the House bill, especially the military readiness and quality of life improvements which our servicemen and women deserve. Readiness is funded at \$647 million more than the President's request and quality of life improvements are funded at \$332 million more than the President's request. These increases are responsible and needed to cover our Nation's legitimate military requirements.

This is a conference report which protects the troops who protect us. It has my wholehearted support and should have the support of all my colleagues as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to point out that when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] makes the motion to recommit with instructions, that we intend to defeat it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 2126 to the Committee of Conference with instructions to include in the conference report the following modification to Section 8108 of the House bill:

None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an executive or managerial employee when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee such as payments under post retirement income plans, payments of deferred compensation, payments under performance incentive compensation plans, and payments pursuant to termination benefit agreements; and

(2) such costs are part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination resulting from a change in control of the employee's company.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 240, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 699]

AYES—176

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)

Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford

Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchesy
Holden
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly

Kildee
Klecza
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley

Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano

Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—240

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Craney
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson

English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe

LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer

Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder

Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taubin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich

Waldholtz
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mineta

NOT VOTING—17

Brown (CA)
Callahan
Collins (IL)
DeLay
Deutsch
Fields (LA)

Frost
Hoyer
McHugh
Porter
Quillen
Reynolds

Rogers
Tejeda
Thompson
Tucker
Walker

□ 1438

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Deutsch for, with Mr. Porter against.

Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. HEFNER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 151, nays 267, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 700]

YEAS—151

Abercrombie
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Bateman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Callahan
Calvert
Castle
Chambliss
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Cox
Cramer
Davis
DeLauro
DeLay
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Everett
Farr

Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Foley
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefner
Hobson
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)

Kennelly
Kim
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McKeon
McNulty
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Reed
Regula
Rohrabacher
Rose

Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Scott
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)

Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stenholm
Stump
Tanner
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Torkildsen
Traficant

NAYS—267

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bilely
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Chabot
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Durbine
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford

Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gephardt
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klug
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McDermott
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick

Nadler
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabó
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Taubin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams

Wise
Wolf
Woolsey

Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mineta

NOT VOTING—15

Brown (CA)
Collins (IL)
Deutsch
Fields (LA)
Frost

LaFalce
McHugh
Meek
Porter
Quillen

Reynolds
Tejeda
Thompson
Tucker
Walker

□ 1457

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Porter for, with Mr. Deutsch against.

Messrs. LUTHER, COMBEST, and NEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. SPRATT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FARR and Mr. STENHOLM changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement for the RECORD that I missed rollcall vote No. 699 and No. 700 in order to be home to fulfill religious and personal obligations. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" to recommit with instructions and "nay" against the conference report on H.R. 2126, Defense appropriation for fiscal year 1996. I wish this statement to be placed in the RECORD immediately following the recorded vote.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to update the Members on today's working schedule.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in contact with the other body. They are taking an assessment at this time to determine the progress they may be making relative to the CR. I will go over and try to make sure that I can get some defining language and report back to the Members. At this point, though, I still cannot advise the Members about the circumstance of the CR in the other body, and we have nothing definitive to report.

As soon as we know something definite, we will advise the floor and advise the Members through a whip call. As soon as I can have that information, I will share it with the Members.

As it is now, we simply must continue to wait on the other body and try to do what work we can in the meantime.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's intention that the House be in recess at that time while we await the other body's deliberations?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have a few items of business that we can conclude. If, in fact, we conclude these items before we hear from the other body, then we would probably have to go into a recess.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman want to tell the Members what might come up, what other issues might be coming before us as we kill time?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman asking. We will be naming some conferees and we will have a few unanimous-consent requests, but there, quite frankly, should be very little, and possibly no floor votes, until we hear back from the other body.

Mr. FAZIO of California. The gentleman would not expect to have any votes, but Members need to keep in touch with the floor in case there does need to be additional action based on the Senate's failure to agree with the CR as is.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is correct. We will share information through the two leadership teams and the whip notice and get as much information to the Members as soon as we get it.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am sure we all appreciate that.

□ 1500

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a sponsor of H.R. 359.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependents, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ARCHER, GOODLING, ROBERTS, SHAW, TALENT, NUSSLE, HUTCHINSON, MCCRERY, SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. CAMP, FRANKS of Connecticut, GIBBONS, CLAY, DE LA GARZA, CONYERS, FORD, WAXMAN, MILLER of California, and Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEVIN and Mrs. LINCOLN.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M. FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1995, TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 2149, OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may have until 5 p.m. on Friday, October 6, 1995, to file a report on H.R. 2149.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 402, ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) correcting the enrollment of H.R. 402, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is directed to correct the enrollment of H.R. 402 as follows:

Amend section 109 to read:

"SEC. 109. CONFIRMATION OF WOODY ISLAND AS ELIGIBLE NATIVE VILLAGE.

"The Native Village of Woody, Island located on Woody Island, Alaska, in the Koniag Region, is hereby confirmed as an eligible Alaska Native Village, pursuant to section 11(b)(3) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act ("ANCSA"). It is further confirmed that Leisnoi, Inc., is the Village Corporation, as that term is defined in section 3(j) of the ANCSA, for the village of Woody Island. This section shall become effective on October 1, 1998, unless the United States judicial system determines this village was fraudulently established under ANCSA prior to October 1, 1998."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONGLEY

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONGLEY:

On page 1, line 2, strike all that follows after "That" to the end of the resolution and insert the following:

"the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the bill (H.R. 402) is rescinded, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, in the reenrollment of the bill, make the following correction:

Strike section 109".

Mr. LONGLEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from Michael J. Schneider regarding this matter.

LAW OFFICES OF

MICHAEL J. SCHNEIDER, P.C.,

Anchorage, AK, September 28, 1995.

Re Leisnoi, Inc., eligibility legislation (S537/HR402 Sec. 109).

Mr. DAN KISH,

Staff Director, Office of Congressman Don Young, U.S. Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KISH: If S537/HR402, in its present form, is signed by the President, it will spell the death of our litigation against Leisnoi. Even if the bill becomes law, it will take a couple of years for the case to be wrapped up. The Lis Pendens regarding Termination Point will stay in place to that point in time. This will preclude any possibility of selling Termination Point to the EVOS trustees. The trustees will have spent their money elsewhere by then.

We want the public to acquire Termination Point. Therefore, if Section 109 of this legislation can be completely eliminated and Leisnoi's eligibility thus left to the courts, already poised to decide it in the near future, we will abandon our current demand that Termination Point proceeds be escrowed pending the outcome of Leisnoi's eligibility fight.

I have Mr. Statman's specific authority to bind him to the proposal above, and do so by my signature below.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. SCHNEIDER.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska to delete section 109 of H.R. 402. That language was added by the other body without public hearings and was intended to intervene in pending litigation. But the Senate did not do their homework. This provision generated significant controversy, especially amongst the affected citizens of Kodiak, AK. Moreover, this technical amendments bill was an inappropriate vehicle for controversy. The gentleman from Alaska and I had worked over two Congresses to develop a consensus on this legislation only to be undercut, in my view, by the other body.

I am especially pleased that, if this amendment passes, the plaintiff in this litigation has agreed to lift a claim to lands on Kodiak which are sought for acquisition by the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 390

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 390.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 895, SMALL BUSINESS LENDING EN- HANCEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to immediately consider the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S.895) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the level of participation by the Small Business Administration in certain loans guaranteed by the administration, and for other purposes, that the conference report be considered as read, and that debate thereon be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent request just agreed to, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S.895) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the level of participation by the Small Business Administration in certain loans guaranteed by the administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, September 28, 1995, at page H9638.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous consent request, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 895, the Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of

1995. This report reflects a strong bipartisan effort to strengthen and reduce the cost of two of the Small Business Administration's most important lending programs, the 7(a) Guaranteed Loan Program and the 504 Certified Development Company Program. All of the conferees, and indeed, all of the Small Business Committee members in both Chambers recognized that we were faced with a difficult balancing act. The task we faced was to meet the mandate of reducing the cost of these vital programs without unduly penalizing the small business borrower. Not only have we accomplished this task, through a modest increase in fees, but we will be able to assist more small businesses with their capital needs with significantly fewer appropriated dollars.

In the case of the 7(a) program, we have reduced its subsidy cost from \$2.74 per hundred dollars of loan guaranteed down to \$1.06, a reduction of approximately 60 percent. We have spilt the increase costs between the lender and the borrower. In addition, we have reduced the Government's risk by limiting the guarantee percentage to a maximum of 75 percent for loans over \$100,000, and a maximum of 80 percent for loans under \$100,000. Private lending institutions will share a greater portion of the risk, insuring sound underwriting standards.

Turning to the 504 Certified Development Company Program, which provides funding for real estate and capital asset acquisition—our bricks-and-mortar lending program, we have made it entirely self-funding through the imposition of a one-eighth of a point interest rate increase. With a zero subsidy rate, no appropriated dollars will be required to operate this program.

In addition, the conferees agreed to accept a provision from the Senate bill to extend the Preferred Surety Bond Guarantee Program. This program, which would expire at the end of this fiscal year without an extension, provides expedited service for small business contractors who need bonding to get contracts, and I am pleased that we are able to continue this much-needed program.

While I don't intend to make lengthy remarks about legislation that is a model of bipartisan cooperation and so devoid of controversy, I would like to address an issue that was discussed at some length in our committee markup, but which was absent from both House and Senate bills. This issue is whether or not we should carve out an exception to the 75- and 80-percent guarantee levels for small business loans, and retain a 90-percent guarantee for the Export Working Capital Loan. I feel strongly, as I believe others in the House and in the other body feel, that a 90-percent guarantee is imprudent.

The Small Business Administration and our committee's distinguished ranking member, Mr. LAFALCE, argued that the SBA's Export Working Capital Loan Program had been harmonized with Ex-Im bank's program both carry-

ing 90-percent Government guarantees, and that changing SBA's guarantee would cause great harm to these harmonization efforts. A majority of both the House and Senate Small Business Committee members did not agree, and no provision keeping the 90-percent guarantee was included either S. 895 or H.R. 2150, making it a nonconference item. However, in recognition of the fact that the guarantee rate for the SBA's export working capital loans will now be lower than Ex-Im's, the conferees have called for a study of the impact of the lower guarantee rate on small businesses in the export market. This study should help us assess whether or not the 90-percent guarantee is vital to these loans, or whether Ex-Im should consider bringing their guarantee rates in line with the SBA's, again creating a harmonized program.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is good for small business, good for the taxpayer, and, as I previously mentioned, a model of the bipartisan cooperation that traditionally graces the work of the Small Business Committee. I would like to thank our ranking member, Mr. LAFALCE, in particular, for his efforts on this legislation, and I strongly urge the adoption of this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 895, the Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of 1995.

The main purpose of this legislation is to adjust the fees and guaranty levels of two Small Business Administration loan programs—steps I reluctantly agree to in order to make the insufficient appropriation level accorded these programs go as far as possible in meeting the credit needs of the small business community. Under current fee and percentage guarantee schedules, the SBA would only be able to approve a small percentage of the loan applications it anticipates receiving in the next fiscal year, given appropriation projections.

Yes, reducing the percentage of an SBA loan which the Federal Government guarantees and raising the fees charged to the borrower and lender will lower the cost of the program to the Federal Government, but another price will be paid in the process. Smaller loans will be more expensive for the borrower and may mean that some small businesses will not be able to turn to this lender of last resort, the SBA Guaranty Program. These changes will also make the loans less profitable for lenders, which may mean that fewer of them will be willing to participate in this program and the options available to the small business person will lessen in this way also.

However, given the budget dollars we had to work with, there were no alternatives to fee increases and lower guarantees.

I am also very disappointed that, although I believe there was fairly broad and bipartisan support for it, we were not able to agree on keeping the Export Working Capital Program at a guarantee rate of 90 percent. After years of talking about the need to improve export assistance for small businesses and eliminate duplicate services, just last year the Congress approved an agreement worked out between the SBA and the Export-Import Bank wherein the SBA would guarantee export loans up to \$750,000 at 90 percent and the Ex-Im Bank guarantee larger loans at 90 percent. We have now reduced the percentage the SBA will guarantee, making the loan seem riskier to lenders, many of whom are new to export financing and already extremely cautious about getting involved. I fear that in reducing the percentage guarantee of an export loan, we are truly hurting small businesses that are trying to export—a shortsighted move in light of the importance of trade to our economy and the balance of trade figures which we regularly decry.

I am pleased the conference report contains the Senate language charging the guarantee fee on the guaranteed amount, not the gross amount of the loan. In my view, the Government is simply not entitled to charge a fee on that portion of a loan which it is not guaranteeing and on which, therefore, it has no exposure.

I am also happy that the legislation extends for 2 years the pilot Preferred Surety Bond Program. This program is desirable not only because it can be a quick and efficient means of getting funds to qualified borrowers, but also because it will inevitably be increasingly important to the SBA and small contractors that we delegate authority for program delivery to outside parties as a means of compensating for SBA personnel cutbacks.

In closing, I would like to congratulate my colleague, Chairman MEYERS, on successfully guiding her first conference report to the floor. We enjoyed a cooperative working relationship throughout the process and I stand here in support of the final product.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I would thank the gentleman from Missouri for his support, and I do believe this had strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I think there was concern that we could not see our way to extending the export loans guarantee at 90 percent. I think a majority of our committee on both sides felt that a 90 percent guarantee at this point in time was imprudent for

the export loans. Since the Senate bill also did not include export loans at 90 percent, it did make it a nonconferenceable item. That is why, since neither House had chosen to do that, it is not in the conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is good for small business, good for the taxpayer, and, as I previously mentioned, a model of the bipartisan cooperation that traditionally graces the work of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to thank our ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], who could not be with us today, and certainly the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] who is a very strong member of the committee, in particular for his efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 534

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 534.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that I was not listed as being recorded on rollcall vote No. 685 on Thursday, September 21, despite the fact that I was here and put my card in the voting machine. I ask that this fact be noted in the RECORD, and that it be indicated that had I been present and recorded, I would have voted "yes."

REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21, AUTHORIZING THE RESTORATION AND PLACEMENT IN CAPITOL ROTUNDA OF "PORTRAIT MONUMENT" HONORING WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of Senate concurrent resolution, (S. Con. Res. 21), directing that the "Portrait Monument" carved in the likeness of Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, now in the Crypt of the Capitol, be restored to its original state and be placed in the Capitol Rotunda and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I support the idea of doing this, because I think that is very important to what we are all trying to accomplish here. I really have no problem with that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that what we do is look at this from an overall point of saying why can we not raise the money privately to do it, instead of spending taxpayers' dollars on it?

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are some structural concerns, because it does weigh 13 tons, that we really have not looked into. I would like us to explore the options and I would like to volunteer that I would be happy to help raise those funds, and I do believe that it could be done privately.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] kindly explain the purpose of the resolution?

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to tell my colleagues that this bill will authorize moving the Portrait Monument from the basement of the Capitol to the rotunda in the Capitol. This is in honor of the 75th anniversary of the passing of the 19th amendment to the Constitution which gave women the right to vote.

The bill will also authorize the celebration of the anniversary and the relocation of the monument on October 25, 1995, pursuant to the amendment that I have at the desk.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that it is time that Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott be raised upstairs. They started off in the rotunda when the statue was dedicated 75 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the resolution, but before that, I would like to state that I understand what the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is saying. But since this is in the very last hour of the end of the fiscal year, and this is a resolution that came from the

Senate with like a 100-to-zero vote, where the money has been allocated from the Architect of the Capitol's budget for this expenditure, that perhaps what could happen is that this House, under unanimous consent, could pass this resolution to move the statue to the rotunda for the commemoration on October 26, and that private funding could, subsequent to today, be sought and could be used to replenish whatever money would be expended.

There is an allocation that has already been reserved. This is a resolution that has a lot of heavy lifting already; heavy lifting on the part of Senator WARNER, on the part of Senator STEVENS, and other Senators who have moved very hard on it with the kind of unanimous vote that they had.

Mr. Speaker, over here on the House side, a lot of people have worked on collecting signatures for those who believe this should happen. I know the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, has worked on it; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN; the gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. DUNN, has been very instrumental on the committee, Speaker GINGRICH has, the leadership, the gentleman from California, Mr. THOMAS. We have a lot of support for doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I think the question is not that these suffragettes during the 75th anniversary of the right to vote should be placed in the rotunda in the appropriate area, but the funding. Mr. Speaker, \$100,000 has been set aside. There would seem to be no problem. I would think it could be done later.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have no problem with raising the statue up and I think it is very commendable that we do that, but I have the same concern of spending taxpayers' money. I would like to see us work out a situation where we could raise the money privately, instead of spending taxpayers' dollars to do it, and still accomplish the same purpose within the time frame.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue here that we are all talking about is not whether we want to move the statue.

Mrs. MYRICK. That is correct.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think we want to elevate this important statue to a point of prominence and I do not think the issue is whether or not a lot of good people, including the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], my good friend, and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], my good friend, have not worked a long time, because I think it is time.

Mr. Speaker, I think many of us that are freshmen came into Congress during a time of budget constraints that we are very serious about. And even

though I can see clearly the good intent, that we will later try to work this out so that there is not public money, some of us have seen a lot of things happen where there were intent, statements made, and somehow in the negotiations with the Senate, et cetera, it really changed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have made a decision, some of us, that we would very much like to make sure that public money is not spent. I hear it is only a few hundred thousand dollars. Sometimes I hear a few million on things. But a few thousands and a few million and a few billion, and this Nation is in deep, deep trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge my women colleagues, especially those who are standing up for this, that we come together and we raise the money.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I just rise for the purpose of associating myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party commissioned sculptor Adelaide Johnson to create a statue to celebrate the passage of the 19th amendment and to forever commemorate the courage and determination of these women who dedicated their lives to gaining for women the right to vote.

It was delivered to the U.S. Congress, dedicated in the rotunda, and sent to the basement where it has been displayed since 1921.

Today, we tend to forget the enormity of the struggle for the right to vote; the brave and outspoken women who demanded the right to vote in this society that still was not even sure that girls should be educated, and who served long jail sentences for their trouble.

The House today, at the end of this fiscal year, will ensure that the statue that honors our foremothers will be given the place that it has long deserved. When schoolchildren come to the rotunda to visit and to Washington to visit this city of monuments and symbols, they will see in their U.S. Capitol, in the rotunda, a statue that not only honors the women who marched for the right to vote, but one that underscores the importance of the right to vote in our American democracy, a right that today so many of us sadly take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that we have this debate, because we waited so long for the right to vote. And mention was made of the fact that I am from Maryland. It was in 1645, in the State

of Maryland, that Margaret Brent asked for the right to vote because she was a property owner, and she was denied that right. She asked again and posthumously, when Maryland celebrated its 350th anniversary, she was given the right to vote and made a member of the general assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this idea was forwarded early on. Nothing was done in terms of following through on it, and I believe that right now we do a disservice to all Americans to say we will forget the reserve that had already been placed for \$100,000 to move this statue and wait for private funding.

Mr. Speaker, let us get private funding. Let us approve this, and then get private funding, and then do a particular celebration of the fact that we have done that and we have raised the statue.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, continuing my right to object, I reiterate that I totally agree, again, on the idea. Actually, it was the Republicans who actually championed this right to vote. It is not at all that I would like to stop the process. I believe that if we all get busy and work, we can raise this money privately.

Having been in government before, I know how it works once you spend government money and try to replace it. It is a very difficult thing to do, because I faced that when I was mayor.

□ 1530

But I would like to again challenge everybody to join in to do it. I believe we can do it and still meet the deadline without any problem. I know offers are already out there for people who have offered to do it and try and go ahead with the celebration on the day that it is set and not stop the process but just not spend the taxpayers' dollars to do it.

I remind everybody again, there are no Federal funds. The money belongs to the taxpayers. We have a responsibility to be judicious in the way we spend it, especially today when we are in all the tight budgetary areas that we are and the decisions that we are making that way.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we should all be thankful for the efforts of these courageous women, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who struggled to permanently secure their rights at the ballot box and in so doing swung open the doors of progress for our mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, and granddaughters.

Today women have more opportunities than ever before to choose what they want to do and who they want to be, whether it is being an exceptionally devoted mother, a successful businesswoman or a Member of Congress. Now only a woman's imagination should limit her. Today the board room table or the operating table may be substituted for the kitchen table, and

women have quickly become mainstays in the American entrepreneurial scene.

In 1920, women refused to accept the status quo and they fought for their opportunity to affect national policy by securing their rights at the ballot box. That fervor should not be and is not lost on today's women.

Relocating the portraiture monument to the Capitol rotunda is a symbolic but important gesture that will finally provide women recognition for past efforts and progress in the world of politics, business and academia.

I think about my own two grandmothers, whose life experiences were vastly different from my own. The possible definitions of what makes a happy and successful life for a woman today is so much broader because we now have endless options.

I would like to take a moment to commend the hard work of my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA, the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, and those who were out in front of this issue in the Senate where this resolution passed 100 to zero. They and their staffs logged in countless hours to ensure this day would come.

With this resolution amended, October 25 will be the day that we will celebrate the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution which gave women the right to vote. With the placement of the portraiture monument in a location of prominence and esteem, we will be daily reminded of and inspired by their great achievement.

I would ask the gentlewomen and gentlemen who testify here today before the public, if they decide that they want to sustain their objection, that they would join our effort to make sure that this portraiture monument is located in the rotunda on October 25, the date of our celebration.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, there are many people who are responsible for bringing this resolution before the House today, and they all deserve our praise. There is one woman I would like to especially note. Joan Meacham, from Mesa, AR, served as president of the 75th anniversary of Women's Suffrage Task Force. I am delighted that my State of Arizona, through the fine efforts of Ms. Meacham, was well represented in this important event.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this year marks the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. I can think of no more appropriate action to honor the women who strove to gain the vote than by placing this portrait monument in the rotunda of the United States Capitol.

Currently, the statues in the rotunda are part of a males only club. It cer-

tainly seems to me a very fitting symbol that Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Lucretia Mott will integrate the rotunda of the capitol—the very symbol of our democracy—just as they integrated voting booths 75 years ago.

The effort to move the portrait monument to this place of honor has been made in a truly bi-partisan spirit. I would like to thank Congresswoman JENNIFER DUNN for offering this important resolution on the floor. I would also like to thank Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA and Congressman GENE GREEN for all of their efforts in the past month. I would also like to add a special thank you to the Members of the House Oversight Committee who convened for an emergency session yesterday evening, so that this resolution could be acted on today.

When the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia, Abigail Adams wrote to her husband John Adams, a delegate at the convention, and urged him to "Remember the Ladies" when forming the new republic. Unfortunately, it was not until 146 years later that the 19th amendment was passed, finally giving women the right to vote. It was passed largely due to the efforts of suffragettes like Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott. These women, and thousands of women like them, made great personal sacrifices to ensure that American women would have a voice in their Government.

In the past 75 years, women have used that voice, and have moved into important positions in every aspect of the Government. Currently, there are 47 women in the House of Representatives and 8 women in the Senate. We have worked, on both sides of the aisle, to bring a woman's viewpoint on all the key issues facing this country.

I believe that it is fitting that on the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage, we remember the ladies in this manner, and move them out of the basement and into the rotunda. I support this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do so.

Although I certainly respect the views of the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I would share the views of my colleague from Maryland that we can work to raise private funds but this is the time to act. It has taken a very, very long time, and I would suggest that we give unanimous consent and pass this resolution.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to state again that I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. I agree that this is very important and that we need to do something. I think it is even more important if the women show that they can raise the money and make that statement to put this statue where it belongs in a place of honor in the rotunda. I again challenge everyone to join in so we can accomplish that fact and get it done by the 25th of October.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

AUTHORIZING USE OF ROTUNDA FOR DEDICATION INCIDENT TO PLACEMENT OF BUST OF RAOUL WALLENBERG IN CAPITOL

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution [H. Con. Res. 94] authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a dedication ceremony incident to the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PASTOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] to explain the purpose of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to offer an explanation for this resolution.

Raoul Wallenberg was a Swedish Protestant who risked his life to save approximately 100,000 Hungarian Jews during World War II, at the time that the Nazi troops occupied Hungary.

He was fearless in this effort. He risked his life; he risked the lives of those around him, and certainly deserves commendation. This country already has given him that commendation; in 1981, he was made an honorary citizen of the United States by the Congress of the United States. In 1994, this Congress passed legislation to place a bust of Wallenberg in the Capitol to commemorate the 50th anniversary of his rescue mission. The purpose of this particular resolution is to allow the use of the Capitol rotunda for the ceremony at which this bust will be dedicated.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, just add a personal comment. I happen to be of Dutch extraction. Many of my relatives and friends were involved in the resistance of World War II. Everyone here, I am sure, is familiar with *Das Tagebuch Der Anne Frank*, *The Diary of Anne Frank*, which chronicles in a very touching and moving way some of the experiences of those who were hid by my Dutch friends during World War

II. It took great courage on the part of many people to do that. They have earned respect throughout the world, just as Mr. Wallenberg has. So I have a particular place in my heart for Mr. Wallenberg, who epitomized the same thing my Dutch friends did and mirrored, perhaps exceeded, their heroism in very, very difficult circumstances.

I strongly urge that we adopt this resolution unanimously and permit the ceremony to take place so that we can dedicate the statue to Raoul Wallenberg on November 2, 1995.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Before making substantive comments, I would like to express my appreciation to my good friend from Michigan, the gentleman from California, Chairman THOMAS of the Committee on House Oversight, to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking Democratic member of the committee, and to the scores of colleagues in this body and in the other body who over the years have paid tribute to Raoul Wallenberg. Specifically, in connection with this resolution are Senator WARNER of Virginia, Senator STEVENS of Alaska, Senator FORD of Kentucky, and Senator PELL of Rhode Island.

I also want to express my appreciation to two colleagues who have over the years been steadfast in their recognition of Wallenberg's unique heroism, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, Mr. GILMAN, and Senator MOYNIHAN of New York.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is so much partisanship in this body, it is wonderful to have a moment of high nobility on a bipartisan basis. As my good friend from Michigan indicated, 50 years ago Raoul Wallenberg, son of a most distinguished Lutheran family in Sweden, risked his life leaving behind the comfort, the safety and the security of neutral Sweden to come to Nazi-occupied and war-torn Hungary to save innocent lives.

Through his heroism, 100,000 innocent human beings were saved. Raoul Wallenberg did this heroic feat of larger than human proportions at the request of our own Government. My first legislative act, Mr. Speaker, in 1981, was to introduce a resolution making Raoul Wallenberg the second honorary citizen of the United States, second since Winston Churchill was the first. The House and the Senate had approved that legislation, and in a special Rose Garden ceremony, President Reagan signed the bill making Raoul Wallenberg the second honorary citizen of the United States.

A decade ago, through legislation, we succeeded in renaming a portion of the street where the Holocaust Museum is located as Raoul Wallenberg Place. Raoul Wallenberg Place is now the official address of the Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Last year, as my friend from Michigan indicated, Congress passed legislation to accept a statue of Raoul Wallenberg, donated to the Congress by an American citizen, Ms. Lillian Hoffman of Colorado. The Swedish Government donated the marble pedestal on which the bust will be located.

We are now dealing with a special dedication ceremony scheduled for November 2. All of our colleagues are cordially invited. We expect the legislative and executive branch of our own Government to be present at the highest levels. The Government of Sweden, Hungary and Israel will be represented with appropriate officials.

We will have in our Nation's Capitol a tribute for all eternity honoring the heroism of a human being, who went beyond himself, who recognized that true satisfaction comes only from serving others, in this case in sacrificing his own life so others may live.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to approve this resolution.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, with great support for this resolution and the ceremony, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 94

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. DEDICATION CEREMONY AND PLACEMENT OF A BUST OF RAOUL WALLENBERG IN THE CAPITOL.

The rotunda of the Capitol may be used on November 2, 1995, for a ceremony incident to the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol as previously authorized by Congress.

SEC. 2. SECURITY AND PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such action with respect to security as may be necessary to carry out section 1. The Architect of the Capitol shall make appropriate physical preparations for the ceremony referred to in section 1.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, I missed four recorded votes due to a delayed airplane flight.

On rollcall No. 664, passage of House Resolution 222, the rule for the CAREERS bill, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 665, passage of H.R. 402, the amendments to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 666, passage of H.R. 1091, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 667, passage of H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1545

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 789

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 789, the Fairness in Musical Licensing Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MEDICARE PROGRAM HAS OPERATED FOR 30 YEARS WITH CURRENT FUNDING

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Medicare Program. For 30 years the Democrats have kept this program operating, serving more than 37 million seniors today, and the Medicaid Program, again which serves millions of Americans. The fact is that this program has been kept in place and it is a current funding program.

Unfortunately, many in this body and many that receive the benefits do not understand what current funding means. It is a different form of funding, and the trustee report, obviously, has to be responded to. But what is taking place here is that the trustee report with regards to the long-term funding of Medicare is being used to blackmail many Members of this body and the senior citizens into voting to or giving up their Medicare benefits.

Madam Speaker, last year in this body we were talking about extending health care benefits to those that do not have health care insurance. Today, because we did not do that, over a million Americans from working families do not have health care. What is going on today is, rather than extending benefits, the Congress is set to take health care benefits away—punching holes in the coverage; reneging on the 30-year commitment.

The Congress will take half a trillion dollars out of Medicaid and Medicare. And what is the purpose of it? The purpose is because the priorities of this body have changed. The goal is to fund the tax break for the well heeled. Medicare is in trouble because the Republicans are in control of Congress and they do not share the commitment to Medicare and to health care for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, last year at this time Congressional Democrats fought to address the problems with our health care system and try to extend health care coverage to uninsured Americans. The health care reform effort was stopped by the Republican leadership. Since that time, another 1.4 million Americans have lost their health insurance, raising the number of uninsured to 43 million. This is becoming the annual rate of people losing their health insurance—a million people a year.

Now the Republicans want to take away health insurance from even more people by shredding our Nation's insurance safety net of Medicare and Medicaid. What a difference that 1 year makes. Last year, we talked about how many more Americans could get health insurance, this year Republicans are talking about how many people they can take health insurance away from, supposedly in order to save money. But we know that as the number of uninsured Americans grows, health care costs go up for everyone—when the uninsured don't get preventive care, they have to go to the emergency rooms for expensive procedures when their health problems become serious.

Under the Republican plan, not only will more families be uninsured and have to face the frightening prospect of being unable to take their children to the doctor when they are sick, but more families will feel the squeeze as they attempt to stretch their dollars between their children's education and rising health care premiums.

Mr. Speaker, even the trustees of the Medicare Trust Fund oppose the Republican plan. The problems we face with health care demand a response, but a long-term solution requires more than slashing health care coverage. The need remains to not consider Medicare and Medicaid in a vacuum, but address the health care system as a whole.

WHEN IT COMES TO AGRICULTURE, LOOK AT THE FACTS

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, let me change the tone here briefly and get away from all of the rhetoric that we have heard and the ostrich and all of that. I do not think this will enlighten in any way the American people.

Madam Speaker, I am here to address agriculture, that agriculture is in trouble and we are having no assistance, no help from all of those people on my left that are worried about what is happening to Medicare and Medicaid. I am worried about what is happening to Medicare and Medicaid. We need to address the fraud and the abuse. If you just made every hospital play it straight and be honest, you would not have to cut and tax and also to add burdens to our seniors. I have a very poor district, and we cannot afford to pay more. We need to work it out.

But let me say one thing, I am frustrated. The board of trustees of the Democrats? Where do you get that? Read the law. Find out who named them. They were Bush's trustees. They were Reagan's trustees. And for some-

one to fix up little pair paper and come and read it and to say the President's board of trustees.

AGRICULTURE POLICY

Madam Speaker, I am here today to express my concerns and clear up some fallacies in regard to Agriculture and Agriculture programs generally. I am very disturbed about the recent attacks on Agriculture from people within the Agriculture community who should know better, and from those outside the Agriculture community who jeopardize the national security of our Nation by their ignorance of Agriculture policy.

First, I would like to take this opportunity to examine the facts, outside the editorials, which daily attack the most successful farm sector in the world.

1995 Estimated total Federal spending: \$1.531 Trillion

1995 Estimated farm income support programs: \$9.8 Billion (0.6% of Federal spending)

1994 Export of farm products: \$43.5 Billion

1994 Net farm exports: \$17.1 Billion

Cost of food for—

Average American: 10% of earned income

Average Japanese: 19% of earned income

Average Russian: 30% of earned income

These figures are the cold, hard, unvarnished, facts. Outside the rhetoric, and outside the debate, nothing but the facts.

In spite of these successes, you still hear critics of the farm programs say that the system isn't working. To them I say: Examine your facts.

Second, I must take issue with the process in which we are now engaged on the Agriculture Committee. Never have I seen a process that is so designed to not only reach a specific, dictated policy outcome, but to also keep the results of that dictated policy from the very people whom it would effect most.

The committee has held no hearing on the "Freedom to Farm" policy. If Agriculture and the American public are supposed to benefit from the implementation of this policy, why not have a hearing and let them voice their support, concerns, or opposition. Let us make these changes in the light with understanding and knowledge, not in the dark with misconception and ignorance.

The imperial leadership has said to the committee members, on both sides of the aisle, your expertise in Agriculture policy is irrelevant, either you pass the so-called Freedom to Farm or else. What is the "or else" that farmers and ranchers are now facing? It is threats of retaliation against Members who voted their district interests over the dictates of the leadership and the elimination of the Congress on Agriculture.

All these threats and intimidation are because the committee had a serious bipartisan disagreement over an option of farm policy. I say "option" because that is what "Freedom to Farm" is. It is merely one policy option that Members can enact to effectuate change in farm policy. It is not the only option, merely one. Anyone who thinks that it is the only way to bring change to farm programs has a very twisted and distorted view of agricultural policy.

Third, I oppose the imposition of additional unneeded cuts on agriculture just because the leadership wants to enact a \$250 billion tax cut. Democrats in committee voted for an alternative that would save \$4.4 billion and meet the reconciliation goals set out in the earlier

reconciliation package offered by Democrats. This package balanced the budget in 7 years. \$13.4 billion in cuts is not needed if we drop the \$250 billion tax cut.

To my colleagues who demand a tax cut, I say, I like tax cuts also. Tax cuts make you popular. However, we are not up here to win a popularity contest we are sent up here by our constituents to govern responsibly. Let's come together to balance the budget and then we can come together and hand out goodies.

Fourth, let the editorials stop and check their facts and give thanks for the American farmer. They can afford, from their well fed position, to be critical of programs of which they know nothing. The European Community spends six times more on their farmers than we spend in the United States. Instead of trying to unilaterally disarm American farmers, they should be writing editorials in praise of them.

One egregious example of their ignorance is writing that we do not allow producers to plant wheat, corn, cotton, rice, etc. This is ludicrous. These programs are voluntary. A farmer can plant anything he wants outside the program. The program merely provides for those farmers who desire it, the choice to participate and minimize their risk. If we are going to be critical of these programs, if we are going to demand change, if we want real reform, then we must do it with knowledge and not rhetoric.

Let us give thanks for the American farmer, the envy of the world. It is not right for us to criticize the very hand that feeds us. Let us join with them to continue to make American agriculture the success it is today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DELAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REGULATION OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned first thing this morning, there was a very interesting hearing yesterday before the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on investigations having to do with the so-called Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich proposal that masquerades as if it were

doing some kind of completely unobjectionable thing, namely making sure that Federal moneys that go to organizations that receive Federal moneys that go to organizations that receive Federal grants cannot use those funds for lobbying. That is already against the law; make no bones about that. But this hearing showed, I think, one of the many, many reasons why in fact this is a proposal that would grossly interfere with the free exercise of political expression, and free speech, and freedom of association, all profoundly important rights under the Constitution of the United States as protected in the first amendment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more instructive witnesses yesterday was the director of political affairs for the YMCA of America, a lady named C.J. Van Pelt, and she gave a very, very interesting presentation about exactly how burdensome, intrusive, and chilling for the involvement of the YMCA, hardly a radical organization, in the political life of this country, and we should understand that we are not talking about lobbying Congress. This bill goes way beyond that to deal with any, quote, political advocacy activities of any individual or organization in this country that may happen to receive anything of benefit or any grant money from the Federal Government. The restriction on any such organization, in this case the YMCA, and I say to the gentleman, "Mr. MCINTOSH, I have only 5 minutes so I'm not going to have time to yield. I apologize."

Mr. Speaker, let me just take this moment. I would love it if perhaps the sponsors of this legislation would agree to a full hour of special orders sometime and we could really engage on this.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think that would be beneficial.

Mr. SKAGGS. Terrific; I thank the gentleman.

Ms. Van Pelt made the following point: Under this proposed legislation the YMCA would be prohibited because it happens to engage in such things as provision of day care, dealing with prevention of crime, drug-aversion education, any number of other things for which it receives some Federal grant funding. Under this legislation it would be prohibited from spending more than 5 percent, probably significantly less than that in the case of the Y, more than 5 percent of its privately raised funds, on being involved in the political life of this country, appearing before a board of county commissioners to, for instance, argue with them about a drug-prevention program in their county or also appearing before Congress to talk about legislation that we may be considering.

But Ms. Van Pelt explained that under their proposal, in order for her, as she would be required or as the YMCA would be required to certify every year adherence to this 5-percent limit, the YMCA of America would have to make inquiry of 140,000 vendors

with which they do business around the country. Why in the world would they have to do that? Well, because one of the little known, but most perverse, aspects of this legislation would count anything that the YMCA spends with anybody else that happens to have exceeded another limit on political advocacy buried in this bill, and anything that the YMCA spends with anybody else that happens to have exceeded another limit on political advocacy buried in this bill, and anything they spent with somebody that violated this other limit would count against their 5-percent limit, and the only way they could certify that they complied was to find out from all 140,000 others with whom they do business to make sure that those 140,000 organizations and businesses had not exceeded their limit on political advocacy. My colleagues can imagine the kind of incredible paperwork burden, not to mention the intimidating and chilling effect on constitutionally protected speech in this country that comes out of just this small part of this ill-advised and perverse legislation.

The extent to which some who advocate this legislation are willing to go was also demonstrated at the hearing yesterday in which unfortunately it came to light that the staff of this committee had engaged in an act of forgery, of concocting what was going to be a poster that was put out on the press table that misrepresented on facsimile letterhead vital information about one of the organizations that was to testify, did it with official funds in violation of any standard of decency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HILLEARY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 5-minute special order be taken at this point out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ENDING WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to some of the statements that were made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] prior to this and also amplify for my colleagues and the American people what our hearing yesterday discovered about welfare for lobbyists, the lobbying organizations who take and receive grants from the taxpayer in order to subsidize their efforts to lobbyists to spend more money.

One of the things we discovered was that it is unknown how many grants there are that are being given. The internal Revenue Service has a data base that says there are \$39 billion of grants, the one with the thermometer, that are given each year to different groups, many of whom turn around and lobby Congress. Well, yesterday we found out that in fact \$39 billion is much too low a number. It is really more like \$224 billion in Federal grants that go to groups who are eligible to turn around and lobby Congress. The taxpayer will not stand for that, but it has been one of the most well kept secrets here in Washington.

Now many of those groups, the YMCA and other groups, perform very important and legitimate charitable services, but even under our proposal that will limit welfare for lobbyists they can continue to speak out in the city councils and at their local community levels.

Mr. Speaker, we have a chart here that shows how much many of the important charities would be able to continue to spend on advocacy issues.

This chart shows exactly how much various groups would be able to spend. The American Red Cross could continue to spend 5 percent of its funds, or \$17 million. The YMCA that we were discussing earlier could spend \$1.2 million. Now Ms. Van Pelt told us that that actually is slightly more than what they are allowed to spend under current IRS regulations. So we have not asked any of the legitimate charities to silence their voice. What we have done is said, Restrict what you do so you don't become a federally subsidized lobbying organization, but continue to be a charity that helps build communities, offer programs for children, for elderly, for those people who need assistance. It is very critical in this debate that we not get lost in the rhetoric and focus on the fact that taxpayer dollars are being used to subsidize lobbying efforts here in Washington.

Just today one of the most heavily subsidized groups, the National Council on Senior Citizens, was in Washington lobbying against our efforts to balance the budget. Now they receive \$72 million a year from taxpayers; 95 percent of their entire budget is from the taxpayer. They are virtually an entity like a Federal agency. But they also have a political action committee. They also take out political ads on TV, and today they are lobbying Congress against the balanced budget initiative.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I do not have time to yield at this point. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] has suggested an hour discussion, and I think that would be a great idea.

I think it is very important that the American taxpayers know that their funds are going to groups who then

turn around and use other moneys to lobby Congress. But we all know that money is fungible and that one of the things that our subcommittee is going to do is track down how that money, in the case of the National Council on Senior Citizens, 95 percent of their funds is actually spent. Does any of it spill over, and is it used for lobbying activities? Does it indirectly subsidize those lobbying activities? Is there an inherent conflict of interest when somebody lobbies for spending, that they turn around and apply to receive as a grant recipient? I think the taxpayer has a right to know, and our committee is committed to getting to the bottom of this issue, making sure that we get through all of the distractions and red herrings and honestly tell the American taxpayers the truth about welfare for lobbyists so that we can put an end to that in this Congress, and we are committed to not doing business as usual, but doing the taxpayers' work and ending welfare for lobbyists once and for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5-minute special order scheduled for this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PLO COMPLIANCE WITH MEPFA

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues for allowing me to reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, in light of yesterday's signing ceremony at the White House I felt compelled to come to the floor today to comment on an aspect of the Middle East peace process that has troubled me for some time. That subject is the failure of the Palestine Liberation Organization to live up to the solemn commitments to which it agreed when it signed the Declaration of Principles, the DOP with Israel on the White House lawn on January 13, 1993.

It has now been over 2 years since that historic day, a day on which the PLO and its leader, Yasser Arafat, agreed to be held accountable for its actions by the international community in exchange for territorial and administrative concessions by the Government of Israel.

□ 1600

As witness to the accord, the United States pledged its political, financial,

and moral support to the peace effort, making clear that it expected the PLO to transform itself from a terrorist organization to a lawful administrative entity to be known as the Palestinian Authority [PA]. The United States pledged the sum of \$500 million over 5 years to the PLO to assist the Palestinians living in areas controlled by the PA with their development efforts.

What we have seen over the last 2 years has been a grave disappointment, as the PLO has blatantly violated its commitments under the DOP.

The PLO has failed to prevent terrorism emanating from the territory it controls and has shown little inclination to prosecute known terrorists or to extradite those individuals allegedly responsible for criminal acts inside Israel.

As recent video tapes of Yasser Arafat demonstrate, he continues to exhort his people to violence against Israel and advocates a Jihad—or holy war—to regain Jerusalem. Even as we speak, Arafat is building up a paramilitary force in Gaza nearly three times what was permitted under the DOP, replete with automatic weapons and a modern security apparatus.

Just last week, the Palestinian Ministry of Information issued a statement condemning the Senate's attempt on the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act to institute a small degree of oversight over funds going to the PLO, calling Congress "racist" and its action a demonstration of "hatred towards the Palestinian people, its leadership and its national rights."

As a representative of the American people and a strong supporter of Israel, I am outraged that the PLO would essentially say "Forget you and your money" when we ask them simply to live up to their word. I'm afraid I cannot sit by and hope that the PLO will suddenly decide to abide by the commitments it made 2 years ago. I feel it is my duty to cry foul when I believe the American people are being had and our national interest is at stake.

The administration has mounted a full court press to persuade Congress and the world community that the PLO remains committed to the peace agreement even when their violations are numerous. As a result, the PLO has learned that there are no sanctions for violating their agreements.

That is why I have agreed to cosponsor H.R. 1960, the Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 1995, introduced by my distinguished colleague, MICHAEL FORBES.

In essence, the bill says that should the PLO demonstrate "substantial, material and timely" compliance with its commitments under the DOP as well as with certain requirements under U.S. law, then the President is authorized to transfer funds to Palestinian institutions and activities directly, and not through the PLO or the PA. Only in this way can we ensure that the funds reach the people for whom it is intended.

Further, the PLO would be required to assist U.S. law enforcement agencies in the apprehension and prosecution of any member of that organization responsible for the killing of an American citizen. The bill also requires that U.S. assistance only be used for humanitarian purposes and economic development—no military activities.

Unfortunately, much of the language attached to the Senate foreign operations bill is unenforceable and weak. Yesterday I agreed to an extension of current law for 30 days, with the understanding that the chairman of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, other interested colleagues, and I will work together to craft language that will bring real oversight and accountability into the process.

Let there be no mistake about my position. I support peace as fervently as any man or woman in this Chamber. What I object to is the process for obtaining peace which requires that we turn our backs on our core national values and our responsibility as guardians of the public purse.

Only the people of Israel have the right to determine the course of their own future. It is our job to see to it that when the history of this extraordinary period is written, we, the people of the United States, have not set aside our values, or standards, or our requirements under law to support a myth, not a fact.

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY AND FINISH ITS WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry that two people back did not yield, because I wanted to ask a few questions. I think it is very interesting that some folks are so exercised about the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts and senior citizens and other people, and called them paid lobbyists and all of this. Yet, when I offered an amendment to try and do the same thing vis-a-vis defense contractor lobbyists and others who were getting 100 percent of their money from the Federal Government, the same folks voted against that. Somehow the Boy Scouts you have to watch every minute, but the defense lobbyists, hey, they are cool, they are our guys. If you think the Boy Scouts and senior citizens have PAC's, you should see what the defense contractors have. You think that the Girl Scouts have clout, you should see what defense contractors have.

In fact, we just saw today a bill rolled out of here \$7 billion over the President's budget, loaded with all sorts of hardware they wanted and golden parachutes and every other such thing. It seems to me if we are going to be really sincere about this, we ought to treat everybody the same, and especially those who are doing it for profit.

One of the big differences between the seniors and the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts and everything else, if I may point that out, versus defense contractors, is defense contractors do it for profit. Defense contractors make money on this. The others are doing it because they are good citizens volunteering, and think they have something to add.

That is not why I really came. I just saw that while I was waiting my turn. What I really wanted to talk about is the fact that here we are, it is fiscal New Year's Eve. Fiscal New Year's Eve comes the same time every single year. Guess what? Of the 13 funding bills that we should have reported and should have done by now, and a year ago all 13 were done and President Clinton had signed them, we are still in this very queasy, queasy, queasy position of what is going to happen. Yet, we are all going to take off and go out of here. I think that is ridiculous. We ought to stay here, get our work done.

I think it is ironic that the only spending bill, the very first spending bill we got through, and we got through in both bodies first, was our own pay and our staff's pay. That looks a little piggy to me.

Today we just voted down two spending bills because there was no consensus. Now we are going to go out for 10 days and come back, and we still have 11 bills hanging out there. We also have the debt ceiling looking at us. All of this is going to come to a smashing crash in November.

My guess is what is going to happen is that there will be so much confusion when people come back, and it will be so action-packed and everything will be so jammed in, that the hope is that no one asks about details, we will all get stampeded like buffalos, we will be terrified if we do not go along, they will shut the Government down, it will be high drama, maybe we should have Academy Awards for who can give the best scene, but it is really frightening.

If we look just at Medicare, we have not had the Medicare markup. It was supposed to be this week. They are saying Democrats are trying to scare them. I think it is scary when they will not show you, A, a bill, and B, they will not have the markup so people can go home and talk about it. We just had a hearing out on the lawn where we asked the trustees, "Have you been asked in front of Committee on Ways and Means to testify on their bill? Have you seen the new bill on Medicare?" No, they have not seen it, and no, they have not been asked to testify.

We heard everybody saying, "We have to do this, we have to do this because the trustees say we have to do this." Is it not interesting they did not ask the trustees if this is the right thing to do? They accuse us of playing politics, but my goodness, the trustees are the nonpolitical ones. You would think if you really want to be nonpolitical about this, take it to the

trustees. Yet they have not heard the first thing.

My guess is when we get back, they are going to cram that thing out of there. They will say, "There is no more time." Of course, they just came back from 10 days off. "There is no time, we can have no more hearings, we do not need to hear from the trustees," and we will shove it all into this huge, big snowball that they are going to call reconciliation.

One of the good things that is happening is the O.J. Simpson trial is cranking down. Maybe the news people will start tuning in and finding what is happening here. But I think the average American is not going to be happy to know we ended the fiscal year without having our work done, with 11 bills not having passed this House, with a continuing resolution hanging out there, with no information about the details in Medicare. I do not think that is anything to go home and be proud of. I am not, and I am really sorry we do not stay and do our work.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JASON REESE, NATIONAL YOUTH OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a happy note and proudly congratulate a truly outstanding young man, Jason Reese, who last week was named the National Youth of the Year by the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

Mr. Speaker, Jason grew up in public housing in the east Tennessee city of Morristown, abandoned by both his father and stepfather. When his mother went back to school while continuing to work, he took on a great deal of household responsibility, including caring for his two younger brothers.

But Jason has done so much more than help out at home—he became a leader at school, in his community, and in the Boys and Girls Club of Morristown.

Among other honors, Jason maintained an excellent 3.83 grade point average in high school, was awarded the prestigious National Merit Scholarship, and won the east Tennessee High School physics competition.

In the community, Jason has conducted programs for the elderly, helped restore a local park, and he currently volunteers his time helping young children with their homework.

Jason Reese's incredible ambition and strong morals—coupled with the support and guidance of the Boys and Girls Clubs of America—helped him overcome adversity and become the role model he is today. I hope troubled youth around the Nation take Jason's example to heart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], who is going to continue to

discuss many of the freshmen's outrage over welfare for lobbyists.

WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly right. How it works, the hardworking people of America work hard, they pay their taxes, send it back to Washington, DC, then some bureaucrat to Washington DC grants that out to some organization that turns around and spends that money to lobby for more money from the Federal Government, to the tune of \$39 billion, that is billion with a B, billion dollars every year spent by organizations in the form of public grants.

We had a hearing yesterday. The opposition to our changes, ending welfare for lobbyists, resorted to calling us names, "intimidators", an "Imperial Congress". Let me tell you, we tore down the walls of the Imperial Congress on November 8, 1994. We are trying to change the way things are done.

It is unfortunate they have to throw out things like "red herrings" and accusations and calling us names. I learned a long time ago if you have to start calling someone names, you really do not have much else to say. That is what is happening here in Congress. They do not have much else to say, so they have to call us names. The fact is your tax money, the working people of the United States, is going to organizations.

Let me show you one of these organizations. For example, the National Council of Senior Citizens receives \$70 million—in fact, it is even under, here it is \$72 million every year—and 96 percent of that money, of their budget comes from the Federal Government. That is outrageous. Then they turn around and donate to political campaigns, to the tune of over \$400,000 over the last couple of election cycles.

The fact is they are involved in partisan political activities, including in my district, they are running as another organization, and they are involved in it under a different name, over \$85,000 in television ads spreading the big lie. It is basically taxpayer-funded political advocacy on the dime of the taxpayers.

When I ran for office I knew that the defenders of the status quo would spend every penny they had to try to stop what we are doing, but I had no idea they would be using the taxpayers' money in my district to try to fight it. That is the problem. I am not against political advocacy, and I am not against them lobbying, but what I am against is them using my dime at my expense. It is time they do it on their own dime and on their own time.

It is time to end welfare for lobbyists. It is time to end the dirty little secret in Washington, DC that costs \$39 billion every year. They are the defenders of the status quo. They will do everything they can to stop the changes that the people have demanded. If they

want to do it, do it on their time and on their own dime.

□ 1615

REPORT CARD ON CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen here in the House of Representatives today is truly remarkable. With the Federal fiscal year drawing to a close, the Republican leadership had a responsibility to put on President Clinton's desk 13 appropriations bills. How did they do?

Well, they got 2 of 13. Where I come from, 2 out of 13 is not a very good grade. In fact, I do not even know that it is high enough to earn an F. Down in Texas we would probably give it an F-minus for 2 of 13 bills, and the quality of Republican leadership that it represents. And when you look at those two bills, you find the quality is as sorry as the quantity.

The first bill they sent over there was the legislative appropriation, protect the Congress first, worry about the rest of the country last. And the second one was a military construction bill so loaded with pork barrel you could hear the pigs squeal all the way to Arlington, TX.

Today, this Republican leadership has had a truly unparalleled accomplishment, perhaps in the entire history of this country. They have come forward with conference reports on two appropriations bills for consideration in this House this afternoon, and they have had two appropriations conference reports defeated. Two up two down. Two very down. In fact, the last one of those appropriations bills, they could not even command a majority of the Republican Members, much less the Democrats.

So, here we are this afternoon, exactly 1 week after Speaker GINGRICH went up to New York and declared "I do not care what the price is. I do not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days. Not this time."

We have had plenty of alarming rhetoric, but not very much responsible leadership. On appropriations, that leadership is 2 bills out of 13, as this fiscal year draws to a close this week-end.

Much of this is because at every stage in the budget process, the Federal Budget Act, the statute on the books, has been looked at as something to flaunt, something to ignore, something to violate from top to bottom. The keystone of this Republican plan to balance the budget is to take \$270 billion out of the Medicare system.

Can you believe that at this late date the Republicans at the end of the fiscal year have yet to even introduce the bill, to take that \$270 billion out of the pockets of America's seniors and America's disabled? They have not even filed

the bill that is the centerpiece of their budget.

From at least the first morning that the Committee on the Budget considered their budget, it was presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Bipartisanship was out the window, because they had their plan and they were going to accomplish it no matter how many seniors or disabled people or people they viewed as powerless got in the way and got run over.

What about that great successful campaign ploy, the Contract on America? Well, they have not had quite as much success once they rolled it out here in the Congress. We have had 2 bills passed out of 11 in the planning. The first one was to repackaging a Democratic idea that would have been law at the beginning of this Congress if the Republicans had not killed it last time. It is called the Congressional Accountability Act. It is a good bill. It passed on day 1 of this Congress and became law.

The second, an unfunded mandates bill, which passed with significant Democratic support. We have a third bill, a line-item veto bill, but Speaker GINGRICH is afraid that President Clinton will use it to slash and slice out some of that pork barrel that has been put into the bill. So he held up and delayed appointing conferees for that bill.

So we have two bills passed, two bills dead and gone, and seven lingering somewhere in the legislative process.

But nowhere has the lack of leadership been more obvious than when it comes to lobby control, when it comes to gift ban, with the relationships between legislators and lobbyists, when it comes to ethics. There we find, as we have just heard this afternoon, that the lobbyists they want to control are the Girl Scouts, the National Council of Senior Citizens, Catholic Charities, and the YMCA.

What about the polluters, what about the lobbyists who keep writing special loopholes in the Tax Code? What about those that loaded up these bills with pork barrel? That lobby control is nowhere. It has not been brought to the floor of this House. And we have the chairman of the Committee on Ethics telling us in her own words this week the letter of the law is not compelling to me; my goal is to have a process that the committee members feel good about.

Well, America does not feel good about what this Congress is not doing or what it is doing, and the way it has ignored ethics and proceeded to pursue a right wing extremist agenda.

WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS AND A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, once again on the issue of welfare for lobbyists,

the facts remain, the President of the United States does not want to balance the budget. My good friends across the aisle are not serious about wanting to balance the budget. The fact is the Republicans have shown a proposal to want to balance the budget. What I do not understand is when we are \$4.9 trillion in debt, and if my daughter Madeleine continues to live to 72, which she will live probably to 172, she will have to pay in her lifetime \$187,150 just to balance the budget.

So why in the world would we subsidize lobbying, when we have all of these other needs out there? Why would we provide taxpayer funds for lobbyists?

Basically in my district, as you can see, they are running advertising, \$85,000 in television ads and Medicare ads and telephone calling. But it is the National Council of Senior Citizens that shows up again as one of those groups that receives over \$70,000.

Mr. MCINTOSH. If the gentleman will yield, are you telling me this group who receives 96 percent of its funds from the Federal Government has bought television campaign ads in your district?

Mr. TATE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is incredible. No wonder it is difficult to get to a balanced budget when you have all these federally subsidized lobbyists out there fighting us tooth and nail.

Mr. TATE. The point to keep in mind is we are sending out tax dollars to groups to lobby for more of our tax dollars. There is something wrong there.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, also a member of the subcommittee that held the hearing yesterday.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk a little bit about some of the testimony we have heard. I do not remember the exact number, Chairman MCINTOSH, of hours of hearings we have had about this issue, but there are several things that surprise me, and frankly just shock me, in the testimony we have heard.

First of all, there are, in fact, groups out there receiving over 96 percent of their entire budget in Federal grants and then turning around and engaging almost exclusively in what I would describe as political activity. That is shocking enough.

But I will tell you what surprises me even more, and that is that some groups have come to Washington and have lobbied against this bill, and some good groups that do good things that we all know the names of, the YMCA, the Boy Scouts, that they would come to Washington and in effect defend this kind of activity. This is an affront I think to every taxpayer. It is in an affront to every democratic loving American, that groups can literally use and abuse the taxpayers' money to advance

their political agenda. It is almost as big an offense to me to see groups coming and defending this kind of activity.

Now, I will be the first to admit that the legislation that is being advanced may not be perfect, but it is hard for me to imagine anybody saying that there is not a serious problem. This is a serious problem.

This is probably only the tip of the iceberg. As the gentleman indicated, we are talking about \$39 billion that is being disbursed. Much of it is being funneled back into political activity. This may only be the tip of the iceberg. I think the taxpayers of the United States would be outraged if they knew this was going on.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] has had the courage to bring this bill forward with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK]. As I say, I think this is something that has been simmering beneath the surface for too long, and I am glad we brought it forward.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. One of the things we found out in our hearing yesterday is that many of the groups like the Red Cross and the United Way and the YMCA who were testifying before us yesterday, would, in fact, not be affected in the amount of advocacy that they could engage in. Because we have a 5-percent de minimis rule, they do not spend that much in lobbying.

My point essentially is that these groups would not be affected in their political advocacy because they are not big lobbying groups. But it is somewhat surprising that they are opposing this. I asked the YMCA do they disclose to their donors that they do a lot of advocacy and that they want to protect the ability of charitable groups to be lobbyists, and they did not really tell me how much they disclose that to their donors. They said they do a lot of mailings, but it was not quite clear when they asked them to give a donation if they tell somebody, "You know, we might spend up to 5 percent of that to be a lobbying group." I think some people would want to know that when they are giving money to these groups.

LAWS GOVERNING NONPROFIT LOBBYING ADEQUATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, persons who are watching this afternoon, I have to tell you, if you are really going to find out what happened at that subcommittee meeting yesterday, I am afraid we are going to have to send you copies of the committee transcript. Because, frankly, you would have to be like Alice in Wonderland, who can believe six impossible things before

breakfast, if you believe what has been said here.

It was made clear by the witnesses yesterday that the law that is already on the books that governs nonprofit agencies is more than adequate. If there is any problem anywhere, if there is some kind of enforcement problem, deal with it.

The truth of the matter is, there has been no complaint to the IRS at any time that these laws have been on the books that any nonprofit agency in America broke that law. There is simply no indication of that at all.

What we have here is a bill that is intended to punish people who do not agree with the other side. They have made it clear. They have beaten up on the National Council of Senior Citizens as though they were the scourge of the earth and were going to bring down the country. We yesterday went through listening to people who headed up agencies, and we have had letters from people like the Girl Scouts, Catholic Charities, the YMCA, that this bill implies they are an enormous threat to the United States because of the grants they get.

Let me just tell you what it means to be a nonprofit agency and what you have to do under current law with Federal money. For example, you may not have any communication with the public and direct communication with legislators in an attempt to influence the introduction, enactment, modification or defeat of new or pending legislation in Congress or State legislatures. That does not apply to universities. We will get to them a little bit later.

You are prohibited from legislative liaison activities, including attending the hearings, gathering information, analyzing effects of such activities that support lobbying or are in knowing preparation for it.

You may not electioneer, directly or indirectly. This covers both attempting to (a) influence a Federal, State or local election, referendum, initiative, or similar procedure and, (b) to establish, support or administer a political campaign party, political action committee, or other organizations.

It's another matter what they do with their own money. It is not the Federal money. They have done nothing wrong with their Federal money. There is no indication anywhere that they did anything wrong with the Federal money that they got.

In addition, there is about a 5-page questionnaire which really smacks of McCarthyism frankly. I just learned today when a similar thing came up in the Justice Committee, that several Republicans took great umbrage at the questionnaire, things that had been asked of citizens of the United States.

For example, this questionnaire wants to know of every nonprofit agency, who do you associate with? Is that any of your business, who you associate with? Second, they have to contact every vendor with which they do business and get from them a written

statement on how much they in their private business spend for any lobbying activities.

In the case of the YMCA, the director told us yesterday that she does business with 148,000 vendors. She said that the onerous restrictions in this bill would obviously meet the purpose, which is to not allow nonprofits like the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and others who have always been perfect citizens, who are really always encouraging the community, to not let them have any say in this Federal Government—to give them an awful choice, to give up their citizenship or what little Federal money they get.

Now, how much do they get in a grant? Well, the first thing we need to know is the State and local governments in the United States get 90 percent of all the Federal grants. Do we ask them how they spend it? No. If they suddenly build something that does not go well, or a train that does not run, or a bridge that collapses, do we say how shameful this is to do this? No. We ask nothing in the world about them. The only restriction that we put on Federal grant money to a State and local government is to not let them charge their membership dues to an organization.

Contrast that to what I just read for you about what a nonprofit organization in this country has to do. Now, if you are a university, you are not even prohibited from paying your membership. Indeed, you can do that.

But when it comes to the misuse of Federal money that goes into the contracts, Mr. Speaker, since I have been in this House, and I am starting my ninth year, the misuse of Federal money that has been talked about most has come in two groups. First, the military contractors—which you all know the stories about the coffee pots, the toilet seats and the hammers; and universities who spent a lot of their research money or grant money for remodeling the university, for the President's salary, for putting dogs in kennels, or whatever other things they have done.

□ 1630

Did we call them before Congress and jump all over them and take the money away? No. We merely said we wished they would not do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a new low. I want to tell everyone what Washington's dirty little secret is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TOP 10 GOP OUTRAGES REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my next text, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

FORGERY OF NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE DOCUMENT

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for that, because I want to tell everyone what Washington's dirty little secret is, since they have been talking about it all afternoon.

The committee staff of this group over here forged a document yesterday. They took a letterhead from an organization that they had asked to come in to testify, took it, as though it was from this organization, copied down the board of directors and listed their members and put next to some of them millions of dollars that they claimed they got in Federal grants.

Mr. Speaker, when we heard from the the National Alliance for Justice, the woman who heads it up, she told these people over here that she does not get a dime's worth of Federal money. She said that she not only resented the fact that they forged that document with false testimony, but she also said, I will not tell you what these people get in Federal money. I do not know. But there is one person here, she said, this afternoon, that has given me permission to tell you how much Federal money she gets. It is the Arts Alliance. Zero. Zip.

Mr. Speaker, do the people care on this committee? Not a bit. I sat as a member at the Waco hearings.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I control the time, and the gentleman will have time later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia controls the time.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has made a very serious—

Mr. WISE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). The gentleman from West Virginia controls the time and has yielded to the gentlewoman from New York.

The gentlewoman from New York may proceed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on the Waco hearings we found that the committee had turned over lots of its responsibilities to the NRA, and now we find this same committee staff is

forging documents to be given out to the press purporting to be a true statement. Mr. Speaker, in the name of all the men and women who served us before in this House, who stood on this floor and with truth and with eloquence did the best they could for the American people, I am more than outraged at the dirty little secret that this subcommittee would stoop to crime in order to make their point.

I am sure they are going to have an hour more of it this afternoon, but if people want to know the truth of the testimony, they should let us send them the record of that hearing.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address an issue because, as this Congress heads off for recess, I think it is time to talk about the Republican excesses.

What has been going on here for the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, it suddenly occurred to me, I hear a lot about Medicare when I am home, and I hear a lot about Medicaid, and they are very, very important topics. But I think it is also important to look at some of the other things taking place that affect middle-income and low-income men and women in this country and to talk about exactly what is taking place.

It occurred to me it is a lot like watching a freight train go by. The train builds up speed, and when it starts rolling, a person cannot pay attention to what is in each car, they just know there is an enormity. There is a big train going by. I want to talk about what is in each car. So I have compiled a list here, and with apologies to David Letterman, we have titled it the top 10 GOP outrages, because I think the people in the country, Mr. Speaker, ought to know exactly what has taken place.

This is not a complete list. This is only a quick culling of the various committees to see what we consider to be the top 10 outrages. Top 10 outrage No. 1, this is the most incredible one, in some ways, to me, because it is the idea that came about in the Senate finance committee called child support surcharges.

People are not going to believe this one. This is if an individual has to get the State to get child support for them and to track their deadbeat spouse down someplace to get that child support, they will now pay a 10 percent surcharge under this one. They will pay a 10 percent commission. Child support surcharges. I like it. It turns every human resource worker into a bounty hunter. Put a star on them, send them out, 10 percent right off the top. They are already down, let us put them down a little more.

No. 9 sort of follows up on this. This does get into the Medicaid area. No. 9 is liens on Medicaid families. This one may boggle people's minds a little bit. Medicaid families, by definition, for the most part, are already low income. In many cases they may be middle-income families that have their mother

or father or grandparent in a nursing home. This takes all the Federal protections that are built in against putting them into poverty.

What it would do, Mr. Speaker, is to permit Medicaid to put liens on the elderly and their families in this way. There would be no more guarantee under the Medicaid block grant of coverage for nursing home care after an individual or family has spent its savings. Right now if a family spends their assets down to a certain level, they do not get kicked out of the nursing home. This would remove that protection. It eliminates current protections that stop the States from imposing liens on personal residences. That is homes and farms.

States would be required to require adult children of nursing home residents to contribute toward the cost of their parents' care, regardless of the financial obligations. Regardless of the financial circumstance or family obligations of the adult children. The States could be allowed to do this.

There would, finally, be no more guarantee, it is gone, that spouses of nursing home residents would be able to retain enough monthly income to remain in the community. Presently, there is some protections for families from Medicaid. Those protections under the Medicaid legislation would be removed. That is No. 9.

Now, Mr. Speaker, continuing in the same vein let us go to No. 8. No. 8 is no more Federal nursing home standards. That one, I know, is hard to believe, that anyone, in their right mind, would say that after all the years that it took to finally get some nursing home standards, some minimal standards so that people are no longer lying in their feces, so that they are guaranteed adequate care, so that they cannot be strapped down without adequate due process, so that a whole lot of other things cannot happen to the loved ones we put in nursing homes, I know it is hard to believe, but, yes, it is true there would be no more Federal nursing home standards. It would strictly be up to the States.

I happen to think States are quite capable of the job, but the reality is, in many cases, it took the Federal Government to make sure there were adequate nursing home standards. So that is No. 8, no more nursing home standards.

To continue this juggernaut, No. 7, if an individual cannot get in the nursing home to get warm, they should not go home, because there is no more energy assistance. The LIHEAP program, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance has been stricken by the Republican leadership. It has eliminated all funding for LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program that provides heating assistance for low-income senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of West Virginia alone last year, LIHEAP served 190,000 people in the coldest

parts of the winter, and it was \$12.2 million of energy assistance.

We can see a pattern developing here. We are going to charge people for getting them their child support, we are going to put increased liens on Medicaid families, we are going to remove the Federal nursing home standards and so that when they get home there is no energy assistance to assist them there either.

I want to turn for a second now, Mr. Speaker, to those men and women who are working and who have been trying to put away enough for their retirement. I call this one "There may not be any light at the end of the tunnel after all." We have worked for 40 years for our pension; right? Well, problem. Because No. 6 is the pension grab.

Here is what happened, just happened last week in the Committee on Ways and Means under the Republican leadership, they have now permitted employees to raid the employee pension plans.

Here is how it works. Presently, companies that want to go into pension assets, the ones that have been built up for the benefit of the retirees, if they want to go in without penalty they can only do so to use the funds for the health insurance for retirees. But to use the money for other reasons they have to pay a penalty tax of 50 percent withdrawal.

What that does, Mr. Speaker, is it tells them to keep their fingers off the pension fund. I think we remember the 1980's and the trouble a lot of people got into, both pensioners and companies. This is designed to stop that and it has been pretty effective.

Now, the Republican leadership would permit firms with pension plans that hold at least 125 percent of the assets needed to meet anticipated pension liabilities to withdraw the funds for any purpose, any purpose, without the worker's permission. We may say what is the problem? One hundred twenty-five percent of assets needed, surely that is enough to cover any future liabilities. Mr. Speaker, it is enough to cover it today when the stock market is high, but what about those pension plans that are heavily involved in stock purchases? What happens when those stock values drop? Does anyone think the stock market is not going to dip?

What happens is, after they have gone in and taken the money out and the stock market drops, then that pension fund is undervalued. The great all American pension grab.

We are not content just to stop with seniors or potential retirees or working people, let us move to No. 5. This one is kind of old but it has such resonance that I thought it should be brought up there because this one will create the ultimate food fight and it is cuts in child nutrition.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, what this will do is to put the school lunch, the school breakfast, the summer lunch program into block grants with lower

funding levels, and also the women, infant and children program will go into a separate block grant and send it to the States. And, yes, I have heard the arguments ad infinitum, ad nauseam. It is like eating the third helping of broccoli to hear this again, about how it is not a cut, it is an increase because we are giving it a 4.5-percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, what they are not saying is that is not enough to keep up with the demand. They are also not telling us that while it is a 4.5-percent increase in their calculations for school lunches, they took from something else that is all in the block grant. It is like it is all on one tray now, and now we have to decide how many beans we want and how many carrots and so on.

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia alone received \$50 million in cash assistance and \$5 million in commodity assistance last year, served 180,000 school lunches, and 77,000 school breakfasts. 57 percent of school lunches in my State go to those who qualify for a free or reduced lunch. And just so we understand, Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is not simply relying on the Federal Government, we put an equal amount of money in ourselves. But making this into a block grant and cutting school nutrition and child nutrition is going to be a real body blow to our children. As the button once said, pick on somebody your own size.

Let us jump back for a second to senior citizens. This one kind of fascinates me. There have been a lot of hearings around here. Mr. Speaker, we all know we can walk up and down these halls everyday and there is no shortage of hearings. My goodness, we had 28 days of hearings on Whitewater alone. The only person who has not been called as a witness is Socks, but he may be coming up shortly.

On this one, what is the program that probably is the most important, the largest part of our budget in health care, most important to 37 million Americans and senior citizens? Medicare. This program has just celebrated its 30th anniversary. Its 30th birthday. If we are going to change it, one would think we would have, I presume, a lot of exhaustive fact-finding hearings. But this leads to number four on our list of Republican outrages. One day of hearings on Medicare.

That is true, the program that is scheduled to be cut \$270 billion, the program that 37 million senior citizens depend upon, the program that is vital to many of the health care providers in this country, the program that helps fund the medical education and research that we all take for granted in this country, that program, 30 years of experience, gets one day of hearings. And, incidentally, some of the witnesses not permitted to testify were the trustees of the Medicare program.

□ 1645

Is not it interesting, every Republican I know has been waving the Medi-

care trustees' report saying this is why we have to make these cuts because of the Medicare trustees' report and then they never invited the people who wrote the report that they are talking about. Interesting. Anyway, that earned outrage No. 4.

But turning quickly in the same vein to outrage No. 3, No. 3 is \$270 billion in Medicare cuts. Why is that an outrage? If that is what is necessary to save the program, by golly do it. That is what senior citizens are saying. They want to see the program made solvent. The outrage is that what everyone estimates to save the program is not \$270 billion over 7 years; it is somewhere between \$90 billion and \$120 billion on 7 years. That leaves a gap of \$150 to \$170 billion too much that they are taking out of Medicare.

And where does that go? Well, it goes, of course, to the tax cut. We will talk about that in a minute; that is \$245 billion. But it has other implications as well. The 40 percent of the money that will come out of Medicare will not go to save Medicare because it cannot. Medicare is in two parts, Part A, the trust fund, and Part B, outpatient care. The trust fund is what is considered in trouble. The trust fund is the only part that you can put money in to "save." That is estimated to be \$90 billion, and yet 40 percent of the money comes out of Part B and therefore does not even go toward the trust fund. It will result in higher premiums for our senior citizens. It is going to result in a lot of troubles for our hospitals.

In West Virginia, Calhoun General closed just this week. I cannot say it is because of this, but this will make it inevitable that other hospitals close. What happens when a hospital closes in that area? When you are injured in Calhoun County, you have a 90-minute drive to the closest emergency room. That is what it means.

That is No. 3, \$270 billion in Medicare cuts, and would not it be nice if we could let the Medicare trustees tell the Committee on Ways and Means what they think of the committee's proposals?

No. 2, 100 percent of senior citizens are going to take a whack, a real hit because of No. 3. Hold that figure in mind. It is not too hard to remember. 100 percent. Every senior citizen. Now, outrage No. 2 is tax breaks for the wealthy, because as those senior citizens are being cut about three times what is necessary to make Medicare solvent where is the difference going? The difference is going to the \$245 billion tax cut basically to the upper income.

Now, I have heard the talk about how there is a \$500 child care tax credit and that will go to middle income and low-income people. The problem is it will not, Mr. Speaker. This tax cut, 51 percent of the benefits go to people making over \$100,000 a year, they get around \$2,400 back. Now, for the person

making \$20,000 a year or less, they get something like \$90 back.

What does that translate into? For about two-thirds of the people in my State, it is 20 cents a day, is what they get back in a tax cut; \$7 a day is what the person over \$100,000 a year gets back. The person getting 20 cents back loses their student loan ability and their Medicaid, they lose their earned income tax credit assistance, and they will pay more for Medicare. Their senior citizen mother or father or grandparent, they may be paying a lot more for them out of pocket, so they are going to lose a whole lot because of this.

So, tax cuts, I thought we were about balancing the budget. If you are balancing the budget, which is tough enough to do in 7 years without a tax cut, you really want to add \$245 billion. Incidentally, if you are making \$350,000 a year, you hit the lotto because you get \$20,000 a year back. The folks at the other end get 20 cents a day back. That is No. 2, tax cuts for the wealthy.

No. 1, I know, Mr. Speaker, this is just a crescendo of excitement. Drum rolls. Really, BOB, that is the No. 1 outrage. It is enough, BOB, you really ought to stop. Stop me, Mr. Speaker, before I peel again.

Here we go. No. 1 is after a lot of consultation, remember I just told you about the tax cut for the wealthy? Now I know you are not going to believe this, Mr. Speaker, but it is true. A middle income tax increase. That is right. Middle income tax increase. While the Republican leadership is putting through a bill that will cut taxes for the wealthiest, it is increasing taxes for low and middle income persons.

BOB, you must be all wet. They would not do that, would they? Look at what happens. Presently there is something in the law right now called the earned income tax credit. A working family in this country that earns under, I believe, \$28,000 a year is eligible for a tax credit. And it not only goes to their income taxes; it means they can get money back from their Social Security tax, their FICA tax and sales tax. It is money directly in their hands.

What it means it is good for business and it is good for the employee, because it is like subsidizing the low-income worker. And when Congress voted to increase that earned income tax credit just 2 years ago that I proudly voted for, and I might add not one Republican voted for, when Congress voted to increase that, it voted to make the person making minimum wage, about \$4.25, in effect it made their wage about \$6. Not one penny came out of the employer, but it was done through the Tax Code.

So now it is being proposed in the Committee on Ways and Means to take back some of that tax credit. What that is is a middle income tax increase. These people will be paying more in taxes after all this passes than they did before.

Let me tell my colleagues in West Virginia, that means that 98,800 middle

income families will face a tax increase, about 90 percent of the families in this program. Remember, the Republican tax plan for a child care credit, it does not pay you the money if you did not pay that much in taxes, so you do not get as much benefit from it if you are in the lower income brackets. But this program, the one they are cutting into, that does pay you. So the Republican plan means very little for low income and middle income people. This plan puts money in your pockets, and that is the one they are cutting. So, the \$500 per child tax credit does not help many of our middle income families. In fact, one in three American children will receive no aid from their credit. They do get aid from this. And so after everything is done, there is a middle income tax increase coming, thank to the Republican leadership.

So let me just quickly run over this list again because I know everybody has got pencils and they are jotting it down. I think Mr. Speaker, that it would be worthwhile for every Member to be talking about this when they are home. The excesses are during the recess, and I hope that every constituent across the country will ask with these 10 things, the 10 top outrages that Congress has been working on in the last few weeks.

First of all, No. 10, child support surcharge. That is right, charging single parent families 10 percent to go get the child support that they are not able to get themselves.

No. 9, relaxing and doing away with the regulations that stop people from having liens put on them on Medicaid families.

No. 8, removing Federal nursing home standards.

No. 7, no more energy assistance for low income senior citizens.

No. 6, going after the pensions and permitting corporations to take money out of pension funds without adequate protection and with no penalty.

No. 5, cutting child nutrition programs making it harder for kids to be able to get that one hot meal a day.

No. 4, only 1 day of Medicare hearings when they were able to have 28 days of hearings on Whitewater, 10 on Waco, and however many have been going on on Ruby Ridge.

No. 3, \$270 billion in Medicare cuts when \$90 billion will do the job.

No. 2, tax breaks for the wealthy.

And of course, No. 1 at the same time they are giving tax breaks for the wealthy No. 1 is actually asking middle income and low-income people to pay a tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, those are my selections for the top 10 GOP outrages of the last 2 weeks, and my hope is that we will all be hearing about these a lot during our October recess.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for up to 36 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that one of the items that the gentleman from West Virginia mentioned as one of his top Republican outrages was the fact that there was only 1 day of hearings on Medicare last week in the House of Representatives before the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, I would like to point out that in my committee, the Committee on Commerce which also has jurisdiction over Medicare, as well as jurisdiction over Medicaid, which is the Federal Health Care Program for poor people, we have not had any hearings on either one of the issues.

In fact, last Friday, we reported out a Medicaid reform bill that cuts Medicaid by \$180 billion and essentially eliminates the entitlement status of Medicaid, so that poor people have no guarantee of health insurance anymore. We did not have a single day of hearings on the Medicaid changes.

In addition, I understand now that the Republican leadership has finally introduced a Medicare reform bill in order to implement the \$270 billion in cuts to Medicare, and my committee, the Committee on Commerce, will be meeting on Monday, this coming Monday, to mark up the Medicare bill without even 1 hour or 1 minute of hearings on the Medicare bill.

So here we have a situation where probably the most important change that will take place in this House and in this Congress, the effects and the changes on Medicare and Medicaid which affect millions and millions of Americans, and we will not have had a single day of hearings on either one of these bills before the time when they came to the committee to be marked up.

It is indeed an outrage. It is an outrage that is out of proportion, when we think about the level of cuts; \$270 billion in cuts in Medicare and \$180 billion in cuts in Medicaid. Cuts that these two health insurance programs, primarily for seniors, cannot take without major changes that are going to be negative and affect the quality of Americans' health care, and particularly seniors' health care, in a very, very negative way.

Fortunately, the Democrats, realizing the fact that there were not going to be any hearings on either one of these programs, decided, starting last week, to have their own hearings, alternative hearings on the Medicare Program on the lawn of the Capitol. We finished 4 days, today, of those hearings, and I want to tell my colleagues that they were very productive hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to give some information about what some of my constituents said who attended the hearings, both health care providers, representatives of hospitals in my district in New Jersey, as well as senior citizens and senior citizen advocates from my home State of New Jersey.

Before I get to that, I wanted to point out the fact that increasingly

this opposition to Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership's Medicare cuts and Medicare changes for both Medicare and Medicaid are being opposed in a bipartisan fashion.

One of the things that has bothered me the last few weeks in listening to some of the statements on the floor of this House is that increasingly my colleagues on the other side, on the Republican side, suggest that somehow this is all very partisan, that the Democrats are attacking the Republican leadership for the changes that are being proposed in Medicare and Medicaid, and that all of this is coming from the Democratic side and that we are just being very partisan about it.

The reality is that increasingly, over the last weeks, it has not been a partisan battle. There has been bipartisan opposition to the Medicare and Medicaid proposals that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership have come forward with.

In a sampling of opposition, this Wednesday there were a number of Republican Senators who expressed concern about the Medicare proposal put forward by the Republican leadership. On Wednesday, there were three Republican Senators who voiced doubts about mixing a big tax cut with planned surgery on Medicare and Medicaid. They said in essence, look, why is it that we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid this amount in order to finance a very large tax cut primarily for wealthy people?

Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah and Senator ALAN SIMPSON of Wyoming and Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO of New York expressed skepticism about cutting taxes while Congress is struggling to balance the budget. They indicated strongly their concern about how they are going to make these cuts in Medicare at the same time that tax cuts were being proposed for wealthy Americans.

In addition to that, I was very pleased to see that in my own home State, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] has expressed concern about both the Medicare changes as well as the Medicaid changes. The gentlewoman is quoted in an article that is in today's New York Times where she says she is concerned about the effects of the Medicare proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman noted recent estimates from the Congressional Budget Office showing that most of the \$270 billion in Medicare savings would be achieved by limiting payments to hospitals, nursing homes, and home care agencies.

These are sobering numbers. They open up a number of concerns about whether the savings will come through a reduction of care or through the new choices that people are given.

□ 1700

I would like to repeat again. In my home State of New Jersey, along the Jersey shore which I represent in Congress, I represent a large part of the New Jersey shore, we had three Repub-

lican State legislators. They are Senator Leonard Connors, Assemblyman Jeffrey Moran and Assemblyman Christopher Moran, all Republicans from Ocean County in New Jersey. They sent a letter to Senator DOLE and also to Speaker GINGRICH this week asking them to back off on the proposed cuts in Medicare because of the impacts that they could have on senior citizens.

They pointed out that financing tax breaks for the rich on the backs of our elderly is morally bankrupt. The Senator and the two assemblymen, again all Republican, also were critical of the increases proposed by Speaker GINGRICH in his plan in the Medicare part B coverage, from \$52 annually to \$1,116. They said the plan is signing a death warrant for millions of senior citizens across the country.

So for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who would suggest that somehow this is strictly the Democrats that are complaining about these cuts in Medicare and what they are going to mean for senior citizens, I tell you we have U.S. Senators, U.S. Congressmen, we have State legislators from the State of New Jersey, all Republicans who are concerned about what is happening here. They have reason to be concerned, for a number of reasons.

Let me give some of the concerns expressed at the alternative hearings that were held by the Democratic Caucus on the lawn on the East Front of the Capitol this week. I attended each of those hearings. We had some representatives from my district in New Jersey who spoke out each of the days, Wednesday through today, and expressed their concerns.

One of the speakers who gave testimony who I was most impressed with was Dr. Anita Curran, who is associate dean for Environmental and Community Medicine at the University of Medicine and Dentistry in New Jersey and the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School in New Brunswick, which is in my district. Dr. Curran pointed out how every aspect of health care in New Jersey as well as in this country as a whole is very interconnected and that programs like Medicaid for the poor, Medicare for senior citizens, nutrition programs, even some of the welfare reform that we have talked about on the House floor, the very cuts that impact health care in each of these programs have a cumulative effect.

She represents the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, a teaching hospital. Many of the significant cuts in Medicare affect teaching hospitals, making it more difficult for those hospitals to train residents and train doctors who are going to go into the community in the future. A lot of those doctors at the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School also work at the Eric B. Chandler Health Center, which is a community-based health center in New Brunswick that handles a lot of Medicaid recipients, poor people who are on Medicaid.

What Dr. Curran pointed out is that when you cut back on the amount of money going to teaching hospitals, like Robert Wood Johnson, you are also having an impact on the community health center because there will not be the teachers there to work at the community health center and help the poor and needy people in New Brunswick and in the area served by the Eric B. Chandler Health Center.

Also, the Medicaid dollars that are being cut for the health center through Medicaid are going to have an effect on the teaching hospital because now all of a sudden there is less money coming in through Medicaid as well. So the cutbacks in Medicare and the cutbacks in Medicaid do not just affect seniors, they do not just affect poor people, they also affect everyone. Essentially, if the hospital in the community does not have the money to operate and either has to close or cut back on services either for inpatients or for outpatients, everyone suffers, and that is the dramatic impact of these cuts both in Medicare and Medicaid.

We had other people that spoke at the hearings that were held out on the lawn. I wanted to mention Margaret Chester, who is executive director of the Middlesex County Office on Aging in my district. She spoke very eloquently about the programs and how these cutbacks are going to affect the senior population that are helped by the Middlesex County Office on Aging.

One of the things I asked about, which was particularly disturbing, again points out how the interrelationship between cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, are a group of seniors or elderly who are called qualified Medicaid beneficiaries. These are seniors who are low income. I think they cannot be making more than about \$625 a month through Social Security or pensions or whatever they get. And right now under current law, their Medicare part B premiums the premium that they have to pay in order to have their doctor bills covered through Medicare, that money is paid by Medicaid. So even though they are on Medicare, the program for seniors, and they have to pay this premium to get their doctor's bills paid, Medicaid says for that Medicare part B premium.

Under the Medicaid bill that was passed out of the Committee on Commerce, my Committee on Commerce last Friday, there no longer is any guarantee that Medicaid will pay that part B premium for those elderly and poor Medicare senior recipients. Where are they going to get the money? Where are they going to get the money to pay for that part B insurance to cover their doctor bills? They are already so poor that they barely can make ends meet.

Their Medicare part B premiums under Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership proposal are going to double over the next 7 years. So, if they were paying \$40 now, they are going to be paying probably \$100 within

the next 7 years. Yet they do not have Medicaid paying for any part of it anymore. There is no way that they can afford to pay that. The end result is that, if some of the States decide not to take on that extra burden, they are simply going to be out on the street. They will not have any health care.

Last, today at our alternative Medicare hearings, we had two senior citizen advocates from my district, one is Dave Sheehan, who is the director of the Edison Township Senior Center in Edison, NJ, and also Dave Keiserman, who is State chairman of the New Jersey Council on Senior Citizens. And what they pointed out and what I wanted to reiterate today is how unable, how difficult it is going to be, if not impossible, for seniors who now receive Medicare to pay these additional payments out of pocket that have been proposed in both the bill put forward by the Republican leadership in the House and the bill put forward by the Republican leadership in the Senate.

I already mentioned some of the proposals in the House bill with regard to Medicare part B that pays for doctors' expenses for seniors, doubling of the part B premiums over the next 7 years. How can these seniors, most of whom make less than \$25,000 a year, something like 75 percent of the seniors in the country make less than \$25,000 per year, how are they going to be able to pay double their part B premiums? But if you look at the Senate bill, the one that is being considered on the other side of the Capitol, they go beyond the increase in the part B premiums. They talk about doubling the part B deductible from \$100 today to \$210 in 7 years. They talk about also delaying eligibility for Medicare from age 65 to age 67. We really do not know how far these additional out-of-pocket payments are going to go. We have heard now about increased deductibles, increased part B premiums, raising the age of eligibility for seniors for Medicare. Where do we go from here?

Well, the bottom line is that increasingly what we are finding, when these Republican leadership proposals go to the Congressional Budget Office, is that there are huge gaps in how much money they can actually save. There is a real question about whether or not any of these proposals on the Senate side or the House side are going to be able to save \$270 billion to achieve that level of cuts in Medicare. And so what I think is going to happen is that we are going to see more and more of an effort to try to find more and more of that money to pay for those cuts out of increased out-of-pocket costs to the beneficiaries, to the senior citizens.

Do not be surprised to see larger deductibles. Do not be surprised to see copayments. Do not be surprised to see eligibility going from 65 to 67 or maybe even to 70. Do not be surprised to see even larger Medicare part B premiums than what has already been discussed.

I just wanted to spend a little time, Mr. Speaker, if I could, on Medicaid,

the program for poor people, which I would point out again, 70 percent of that money in New Jersey for Medicaid goes to pay for senior citizens and those who are primarily in nursing homes. The figure for the rest of the country is pretty much the same. A majority of the money that we now spend on Medicaid, even though it is a program for poor people, is for senior citizens, most of which pays for nursing home care.

The bill that our Committee on Commerce reported out on Medicaid last Friday was a travesty. We had no hearings, again. Whatever they do on Ways and Means, we do not have any hearings in the Committee on Commerce. We get the bill and then the next day we have the markup, and we do not even have an opportunity to have a hearing at all.

In the Committee on Commerce, the Medicaid bill that was reported out was indeed a travesty. The New York Times, in an editorial on September 26 called it a cruel revision of Medicaid. Just let me give you a sentence for two. They said, "Congress shows no signs of slowing its assault on the social safety net stitched together over six decades. The House Commerce Committee tore another hole in the net on Friday by eliminating the Federal guarantee of Medicaid insurance."

Essentially, what the Republicans did in this Medicaid bill was to eliminate the entitlement statute for Medicaid. So in effect, there is no guarantee that anyone gets Medicaid coverage anymore. They send the money in a block grant to the States, and they leave it up to the States to decide what they want to do with the money, with very few strings attached.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I had a forum last Monday, actually it was Tuesday, in my district, after this Medicaid bill had passed out of the Committee on Commerce. And I told the senior citizens at a senior center in Long Branch, the town that I live in, about some of these cuts and what they will mean, and they were really outraged. And they had reason to be outraged.

One of the things that we pointed out to the seniors and really to my constituents in general is the fact that all the protections that existed under the Medicaid Program in the past, when someone had to be placed in a nursing home, all the protections with regard to the nursing home, all the protections with regard to the family of the person who went to the nursing home, the family, the spouse that had to stay back in the home or the kids that were still in the community, all those were just eliminated completely by the Republican majority on the Committee on Commerce.

There are no longer any nursing home standards. The money goes to the States in a block grant. The nursing homes can do what they want unless the States come in and start regulating them. So all the concerns about proper

sanitation in nursing homes, code enforcement in nursing homes, proper care, that there are nurses that are visiting the patients in nursing homes, none of that has any Federal protection anymore. Just as bad was the fact that the protections for the spouse who has to stay at home were eliminated.

Right now, under current law, if your husband goes to a nursing home and you are the woman who stays at home, you get to keep your home, you get to keep your car. And you get to keep about \$14,000 in a savings account that they cannot go against you to pay for that nursing home care for your husband who is in the nursing home. That is all out the window now. If a State wants to, they can simply go after those assets or include those assets in calculating whether or not someone is eligible for Medicaid placement in nursing home.

They also eliminated all the protections under current law for children. So there is nothing to prevent a State, if it wants to, to say, your dad is now in a nursing home and so we are going to go after your house, the children, or we are going to go after your assets to pay for his nursing home care. Again, all those protections were simply eliminated.

The other thing that happened, which I found extremely disturbing, is that the Federal law right now with regard to Medicaid, links the actual reimbursement rate that is paid to nursing homes to a standard based on the amount of money that is necessary to pay for adequate care. In other words, the States, under current law, have to give the nursing homes enough money to pay for adequate care of the person who is in the nursing home. That was abolished. We had a vote on it. Again, it was voted down by the Republican majority.

So what we are going to see increasingly is less money going to the States, no safeguards for the States, the States paying less and less money for nursing home care that is less than adequate, and no way to make sure that under Federal law that those nursing homes are adequate and provide proper care.

The last thing that I wanted to mention, going back again to the fact that this is not at all a partisan issue, and I hate the fact that it keeps being characterized as such, is that in my home State of New Jersey, in a lot of the other States around the country, many of the Republican elected officials have been very critical of this Republican leadership Medicaid proposal because of the formula that is being used to decide how much the individual States are going to receive.

I would point out that it really does not matter what the formula is because since there is going to be so much less money going to the States to pay for Medicaid, however you figure out the formula, the States are not going to have enough money to provide adequate care. But I want to commend my

Governor, Governor Christine Whitman, and also the members of my State delegation, the Republicans in my State delegation, New Jersey, all of whom have protested to Speaker GINGRICH and to the Republican leadership that the formula for Medicaid is inadequate and certainly unfair to the State of New Jersey.

□ 1715

Now what the Governor of New Jersey pointed out is that in the next year, in 1996, there will be a 7.2-percent Medicaid grant increase to the States under the formula that Speaker GINGRICH has put forward, but after that, for the fiscal years from 1997 to 2000, there is only a 2-percent annual increase in the amount of money the States get to provide for Medicaid expenses, and essentially what the Governors said, and I quote, is that "we cannot achieve that level of savings, we cannot operate that program with the level of money that we are going to be getting from Medicaid."

So, if I could just conclude by pointing out again, as much as most of the people opposing this Gingrich plan are Democrats, there are a lot of Republicans in my State and in other parts of the country at every level, whether it is the Senate, whether it is the Governors, whether it is the other members of our congressional delegation, or State legislators who are pointing out that there is absolutely no way that we can continue to provide adequate care under the Medicaid Program for our poor people and particularly for our elderly who are the main beneficiaries of the Medicaid Program, and the same concerns are now being expressed as well on the Medicare Program, that this level of cuts that are being proposed by Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership are simply inadequate to provide quality care for our seniors and for the people who are part of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the cracks are starting to show, that we are seeing a slowdown in effect in the effort to try to move both of these bills through Congress. We have a week now, next week, and there will be no votes on the floor of the House of Representatives on any bills, and I am hopeful that the momentum will continue to build during this next week so that, when we come back around Columbus Day, there will be even more and more opposition on a bipartisan basis to these terrible changes that are being proposed in the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

CONGRATULATING NATIONAL "VOICE OF DEMOCRACY" WINNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, to begin this special order tonight I would like to read a statement and some passages to pay tribute to a young man in my district. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to a truly remarkable youngster. His name is Niles Randolph, and he is the first-place winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" broadcast scriptwriting contest for the State of Minnesota.

Niles is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Randolph and is currently a senior at Mayo High School in Rochester, MN. He was sponsored by VFW Post 1215 and its ladies auxiliary in Rochester.

His interests include football, playing the guitar, soccer, and racquetball. He is also a member of the National Honor Society and has held the offices of 6th grade class officer, 9th grade class officer and 11th grade junior representative.

Niles is interested in attending the University of Wisconsin at Madison or Drake University in Des Moines where he intends to pursue a degree in Public Relations—I am sure he will be very successful.

His essay titled "My Vision for America" was a genuinely patriotic piece of writing, and I am honored to share several passages from that tonight:

I was once told the story of two brothers who quarreled all the time. The father of the boys, to teach a lesson, gave them a bundle of sticks tied together and challenged them to break it. Try as they might, they could not. Then the father untied the sticks and gave each one separately to the boys. He again challenged them to break the sticks. They did with ease. The father then said, "You see my sons, untied as one, the sticks are strong and cannot be broken. Apart, they are weak and vulnerable." No longer did the brothers quarrel.

My vision for America is one of unity. As the story relates, we are strong when tied together. When we are separate, we are weak and vulnerable. When we are together as Americans, free from prejudice, ignorance and selfishness, we are strong. That is my vision for America.

To attain greater unity, I feel we must look at the basic unit of our nation. That unity is the family. The strengthening of the American family is an essential key to the solidarity of our nation. The family is the teacher of moral principles and values, the most influential guide in someone's life. Too many times in modern society do we see the decay of family; failed marriages and single parents, or the increase in gang numbers due to lack of family support. The family has been the backbone of American society throughout our history. It has been the reason America has remained as strong as it has. The family is where it all starts, where everyone develops their character and their values, where everyone must attain their moral principles.

In becoming a more unified nation, we must eliminate prejudice. Racial and sexual prejudice undermine the American idea of equality and equal opportunity.

All of these factors combine to make a unified America. Through patriotism, stronger family bonds, education, and elimination of prejudice, we stand united as one, as the sticks were unbreakable when tied together. Let us maintain our seat as leaders of the

world in morality and virtue. Let us come together in unity. This is my vision for America.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the balance of the text to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MY VISION FOR AMERICA

I was once told the story of two brothers who quarreled all the time. The father of the boys, to teach a lesson, gave them a bundle of sticks tied together and challenged them to break it. Try as they might, they could not. Then the father untied the sticks and gave each one separately to the boys. He again challenged them to break the sticks. They did with ease. The father then said, "You see my sons, united as one, the sticks are strong and cannot be broken. Apart, they are weak and vulnerable." No longer did the brothers quarrel.

My vision for America is one of unity. As the story relates, we are strong when united together. When we are separate, we are weak and vulnerable. When we are together as Americans, free from prejudice, ignorance, and selfishness, we are strong. That is my vision for America.

I am a member of my high school football team. Through experience, I have learned that teamwork is the key to winning. When members of the team fight, or become selfish in their interests, they are drawn apart and more often than not, we lose. In order to succeed there must be blockers for each running back and defensive support on every play.

I can see a correlation between American society and my football experiences. If we are together in our interests and goals, we will succeed as a nation. If there is sound education for our youth, it is much like having the blocker for the running back. The youth and the running back are much more likely to succeed. If we have a strong family bond and support, it is much like the defensive support, as it reinforces. If we are drawn apart by prejudice and lack of patriotism, it is much like team members fighting or being selfish. Whether in football or in society we must be united to succeed.

To accomplish this goal, we must embrace patriotism. People are often concerned only with their current situations and problems. Nobody must forget the America that has given us such unequalled opportunity and liberty. My vision for America would be a patriotic America. An America concerned about the future of our nation, as the past generations have been concerned. From the times of the Revolutionary War, to the times of Korea and Vietnam, our predecessors have given their very lives for the benefit of America and its future generations.

A revival of these principals and regard for our nation would unquestionably bring us together as Americans.

To attain greater unity, I feel we must look at the basic unit of our nation. That unit is the family. The strengthening of the American family is an essential key to the solidarity of our nation. The family is the teacher of moral principles and values, the most influential guide in someone's life. Too many times in modern society do we see the decay of family; failed marriages and single parents, or the increase in gang numbers due to lack of family support.

The family has been the backbone of American society throughout our history. It has been the reason America has remained as strong as it has. The family is where it all starts, where everyone develops their character and their values, where everyone must attain their moral principles. In the past, families have been the base of America. They can be the base once again. The strengthening of the family unit is my vision for America.

In becoming a more unified nation, we must eliminate prejudice. Racial and sexual prejudice undermine the American ideal of equality and equal opportunity. Only through education can we curb prejudice, as prejudice stems from ignorance. My vision is to eliminate racial and sexual prejudice.

Another aspect of American unity is education. Education, whether in the form of elementary schools or colleges, is the key to a successful future. Only by knowledge can we grow and adapt. The children of tomorrow demand a sound education in order to lead our country in the coming years.

All of these factors combine to make a unified America. Through patriotism, stronger family bonds, education, and elimination of prejudice, we stand united as one, as the sticks were unbreakable when tied together. Let us maintain our seat as leaders of the world in morality and virtue. Let us come together in unity. This is my vision for America.

Mr. Speaker, for the balance of this special order I would like to talk a little. We have heard from the other side of the aisle this evening about some of the things that this Congress has not accomplished. We have heard some complaints about our Medicare reforms and our Medicaid reforms, and I think it would be appropriate tonight to talk a little bit about some of the things that we have accomplished, and I would like to first call attention to a column which appeared about a week ago in the Washington Post by columnist David S. Broder, and even the title of the column, I think, says an awful lot about this Congress, the 104th Congress, and what has really been happening. The title is "A Rout of Historic Proportions," and perhaps I could just read a couple of paragraphs, and the first paragraph starts:

Whatever happens in the final weeks of this session, it is now a certainty that the 104th Congress will go into the history books as one of the most significant in the last half century. It marks as fundamental a rightward turn in domestic policy as the Great Society 89th Congress in the 1965-1966 session did in a turn to the left.

In fact, let me just also close with the last couple of paragraphs where it says unlike Haley Barbour in 1993-1994, the leadership of the Democratic National Committee has been unable to coordinate a single message, nor have they been able to muster the kind of effective interest group and lobbying support that Republicans have used to get their allies in business in a broad range of ideological groups together. The result has been a rout of historic proportions in a Congress which will be long remembered, and I am happy to have with me this evening the gentleman from the great State of Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH], and I would like to yield to him to talk a little bit about some of the accomplishment of this Congress, some of the distortions we have heard from the other side, and some of the reasons, as we go forward, we are going to continue to press the agenda and change the way Washington does business.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], and certainly thank him

for his leadership throughout this entire process that we have been going through, and, if you look at the Washington Post editorial, it really is a season of change in Washington, DC.

I campaigned, like you and a lot of other people, over a year and a half against all odds to get elected up here to make a difference, to come up here and make a difference, to change the way that Washington works and to change the fundamental concepts that run Washington, DC, and we have done that.

You mentioned the Washington Post editorial and the column that says that this is the most significant Congress in probably 50 years or so. It talks about ending welfare state as we know it. There is a Wall Street Journal article that quotes several, quotes several congressional historians, who say this is not only the most historical Congress in the 20th century, it is probably the most historical House of Representatives session since the 1870's, since Reconstruction, and sometimes when things are moving as fast as they are right now, sometimes people tend to forget all the things that have been accomplished.

You know, if you are like me and like many Americans, the changes that happened after the Iron Curtain came down in 1989, when one Communist country fell after another Communist country fell, it seems that the rate of change happened so much that people started taking it for granted, but look back at what we have accomplished these first 9 months. It is just absolutely staggering.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman would yield, one way you can think about this in terms of the difference, or one way, perspective, you can gain from this in terms of looking at where we are at today, is think about what would be happening in this Congress today had the Democrats retained the majority status both here in the House and in the Senate. Think about what the difference would be. Would we be debating at a national level whether we ought to get to a balanced budget in 10 years or 7 years? Would that be what the debate is about, or would it even be remotely on the table that we are talking about getting to a balanced budget at all under any circumstances? And I would submit to you that the answer to that is pretty obviously that we would not be talking about when we are getting to a balanced budget, which is, under our plan, obviously it is 7 years with real numbers. Under the President's plan it—maybe it is 10 years with numbers that have been scored differently by CBO, but in any event you can see clearly how the debate has been moved, and you can be doggone sure that, if the Democrats still controlled the House of Representatives, we would not be talking about that at all.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, let us just look at recent history to amplify on what the gentleman has

just said. Would we be even talking about to balance a budget at all?

Let us look at what the President of the United States said this summer. In June, he said a balanced budget is not a priority of this Government, we do not need it right now. Then he went up to New Hampshire a month later, which coincidentally happens to be the first primary, and the voters said we need a balanced budget. So the President said we need a balanced budget. Then he came back to Washington. His advisers said we do not need a balanced budget. The President said we do not need a balanced budget. Then he went back up to New Hampshire, and the voters told him we need a balanced budget, and the President said we need a balanced budget, and this goes back and forth. The President did not even know if we needed a balanced budget. The majority of the Democratic Members have been arguing against any plan to balance the budget for over 9 months now. There is no leadership on that side of the aisle to do what over 88 percent of Americans want us to do, and that is just spend as much money as we take in, and, if you look at that, if you look at welfare reform, 1 year ago they are talking about spending more. We are talking about bringing in the reins. If you look at Medicare reform, we have a plan now that saves Medicare. Ask the seniors. Ask AARP. They know it saves Medicare. Again nothing from the other side.

This Shays amendment to make Congress abide by the same laws that the rest of the country has to abide by—look what we are doing in corporate welfare. We are trying to eliminate the Department of Commerce, and who is the defender of corporate welfare? It is the Democrats. Who is the defender of welfare for lobbyists? It is the Democrats.

I mean I just cannot believe the world has changed 180 degrees.

We had on the same day that the Washington Post attacked the Democratic Party for being demagogues on Medicare, the Wall Street Journal attacked the Republican Party for cutting \$35 billion in corporate welfare tax loopholes.

□ 1730

I will take that attack any time. Yes, I admit it before God and country: I am against corporate welfare. I just wish the Members on the other side of the aisle felt the same way about it. Taxpayers work too hard.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the author of the Shays Act. It is important for us to look back and see how much has changed. As you indicated, it is no longer a debate about if we are going to balance the budget, it is a debate about when and exactly how we are going to balance the budget. It is no longer about when we are going to save Medicare, it is about how we are

going to save Medicare. We have completely changed the debate. That all started on the very first day.

I was so privileged to stand on this very place on the first day on the job and be the lead spokesman on the adoption of the rule for the Shays Act, H.R. 1. I was also privileged to have been the first freshman in 100 years to have been invited to the White House for the first bill signing. That was not the only thing we did on the first day. I think sometimes people forget how the paradigm shift began on the very first day.

On the very first day, let us remind ourselves, we slashed the number of committees and committee staffs by one-third. We ended baseline budgeting. We changed the way the budgets are put together around here. We ended proxy voting, so Members actually have to go to committees.

Mr. HOKE. Would you explain, just for the Speaker, because I know that the Speaker is interested in this, but would you explain for the Speaker exactly what the elimination of baseline budgeting means, and know that relates to having the Government work with numbers the same way that you and I and our spouses and our kids work with numbers at home?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can explain baseline budgeting. Essentially, I think the way it works is that the budget automatically goes up by about 6 percent. Anything you reduce from that is called a cut around Washington. Everywhere else, in every coffee shop, in every family, at every business, when you actually increase spending in real terms from one year to the next, that is called an increase, but with the convoluted baseline budgeting that has been used around here, that is not the way it is.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think this is important. You are asking a question that gets to the heart of this. If you want to talk about double-speak, Orwellian double-speak, I have seen it.

Mr. HOKE. Voodoo numbers.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Voodoo numbers, where in the past a spending increase was called a spending cut. This year when we are talking about abolishing the Department of Commerce, we have Secretary Ron Brown telling us that there is not a penny of corporate welfare in that department, and that abolishing the Department of Commerce will cost the American taxpayers billions and billions of dollars.

Let me get this right, now. According to the Democrats, a spending increase is actually a spending cut, and a spending cut is now called a spending increase. As a Democrat says, "Beam me up, Scotty. I cannot take it anymore. I don't understand that."

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if I can borrow the time just for a moment, I actually think this is a critically important point. This one thing that we did, and we did it in the Committee on the Budget, and I know the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] was

there the day we did it, it is so important to the running of this place, because it means now when we talk about numbers, when we say that we are going to spend 4½ percent more on the School Lunch Program in 1996 than we did in 1995, which is exactly what we are going to do, we are using the same language that everybody else in America uses on a daily basis. We have not been doing this for 20 years.

I will tell you something else, just to be honest. Baseline budgeting did not begin under a Democratic administration, it began under a Republican administration. We brought upon ourselves a great disservice. It is wrong, we have fixed it. And now when we talk about a cut, it means it is a cut from what we spent last year. When we talk about an increase, it means it is an increase over what we spent last year. It is real numbers, it is truth in budgeting.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Reclaiming my time, just to sort of review again all the things we accomplished on that first day, we opened the committee process so that staff and the press could come, the public could see what was happening in the committee meetings. We mandated a three-fifths vote on any tax increase, and began a comprehensive audit of the House books. For the first time, we are opening up this process to the public, we are going to show our books to the public so people have an opportunity.

I do want to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the author of the Shays act. Incidentally, I want to reinforce what an important act that was. When I was campaigning last year, I was surprised to learn how many laws that the Congress itself, in fact it had almost become routine for the Congress to exempt itself from the implications of a lot of the laws that they passed against everybody else. I think a big part of changing the attitudes of Members of Congress was to make us live by the same laws that we impose on everybody else.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS]. He does not necessarily have to talk about the Shays act. I do not want him to brag about himself, necessarily, but I do want to talk a little bit about Medicare or Mediscare that is going on around the country now. I think the good news is that the American people are a lot smarter than some people give them credit for. They understand that increasing the expenses per capita from \$4,800 to \$6,700, they understand that is not a cut, that is a significant increase. They believe the system can be saved.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to involve myself in this debate, because you are talking about the difference since the beginning of this year with the new majority. What we did is we ended 40 years of one-party control. That was a system where the chairman

became so dominant that even a rank and file Democrat had no power, even in the majority.

I would wager to say a rank and file Democrat Member has more power today under our system than they did under their system, which meant that the chairman decided every issue. You would bring a bill before the chairman. If he did not want to hear it, it did not happen. If the chairman did not want to have a public hearing on it, it did not happen. If the chairman did not want to invite these witnesses, it did not happen. If a bill was being debated and someone wanted to amend it and the chairman did not want it to be amended, under the old system it did not happen.

What we have now is the expression of a lot of different ideas. We have a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle empowered to make significant change.

I remember when the Contract With America was first brought forward. We, and I am looking at the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HOKE, because we are fortunately in the majority, because we are here with three outstanding new Members of this House. For the first time as incumbent Members, we said that "If you elect us, you will elect a change of government." Then we invited those who were challengers to participate in making up our Contract With America and giving the American people a very positive presentation.

I remember the press when we did this said, "This is ridiculous." They said, "It is going to cause the defeat, particularly of moderate Republicans." I was thinking to myself, "Why would it do that? There are eight major reforms to this institution. We have 10 major bills we would pass during the first 100 days." However, they said, no, it would cause our defeat. When no Member lost, moderate or conservative, who was a Republican, and all these new Members were reelected, they said, "You used this contract to get elected but you would not implement it".

Then we started in the opening day. I remember candidly thinking the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], thinking he was going to be in charge of the rule. I was thinking these new freshman Members, I could not have brought out a bill on the opening day or dealt with a rule. And I was thinking, "Can you guys do this?" You got together as a group, I watched what you did, you came to the floor of the House, you presented the rule. I could not have been more proud of any Republicans than to see what our freshmen did on opening day. They basically were the only ones to speak, the only ones to bring out the rules. It was awesome.

I just want to thank all of you for what you have done to make it possible for this country to change. I make this point to you. They said moderates would lose. Moderates did not lose. Then they said we would not complete our Contract With America, we would

not try to work on these eight reforms and these 10 bills, and we did. Then they said moderates and conservatives could not work together. We get along fine. In fact, we find we have a heck of a lot in common.

Then they said, "You will not get along with the Senate." I actually like Senators and we work well with the Senate. Then they said, "You voted to balance the budget, but you would not be so stupid as to vote to balance the budget and cause a lot of anguish and all those special interests that are going to weigh in." And would you look at entitlements? That has been sacred, that we should not look to try to get our financial House in order. We are doing that.

This is what we have done. We have left the old world for the new world. We are not going back to the old world. We burned our ships. We are in the new world. We are going to conquer this new world. We are going to make sure the American people see a change.

What are they going to see? They are going to see us get our financial House in order and balance the budget. They are going to see us save our trust funds, particularly Medicare. They are going to see us change this corporate, this social and corporate welfare state, into an opportunity society. I really believe we are going to accomplish all that.

I would love to weigh in just a little bit on the whole issue of Medicare, but I do not want to monopolize the time, just to say it is really a pleasure to be with you. We need to talk about what we and the American people have so much to be proud of, a new Congress that is bringing extraordinary change.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I think we do want to have a little discussion about Medicare, because there is still so much distortion going on out there about what really is going to happen with Medicare.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I would say my understanding that what the gentleman from Connecticut intends to do with Medicare is to cut \$270 billion from Medicare over the next 7 years in order to give \$280 billion in tax cuts strictly to wealthy Americans. Is that what is going on here?

Mr. SHAYS. The amazing thing is you got the Democrat story all in one sentence, and it is all wrong. There is a \$240 billion tax cut. About half of it is going to families with children. These are children under 18, a \$500 tax cut.

Mr. HOKE. Families with incomes under—

Mr. SHAYS. Incomes under \$200,000. It may be that ultimately that number comes down, but 75 percent of all families make \$75,000 or less, so 75 percent of the people who get this benefit make \$75,000 or less than \$75,000. Why would we want a \$500 tax credit? It is quite simple.

My parents, and I am one of four boys, in the 1940's and 1950's took the

equivalent deduction off their taxes of today of \$8,000. In other words, they had the benefit of being able to deduct for every child in today's dollars \$8,000 off their total income. That is \$32,000 that they could deduct from their total income. It meant they did not have to pay taxes on \$32,000.

What are families allowed today? They are allowed \$2,500. Families when we were growing up only paid 20 percent in taxes, Federal, State and local. They pay 40 percent today, so our first effort is to help young families cope with what is a very difficult environment. That is part of our tax cut.

The thing I want to weigh in on is that we paid for it. We made cuts to this budget, and I know, because you and I were on the budget, and my colleagues, we have all had to vote to cut spending to pay for it. It has nothing to do with Medicare. Medicare is a separate challenge. Medicare is going bankrupt, Medicare part A. We have to save that trust fund, totally separate.

So, wrong, first, that this is a tax cut for the wealthy; wrong that it somehow, that the tax cut, is related to Medicare. Let me make one last point. The most outrageous thing is to say it is a cut of \$270 billion. We spent, in the last 7 years, \$900 billion. In the next 7 years we are going to spend \$1.6 trillion. We are going to spend well over \$600 billion more in the next 7 years than the last 7. We are going to spend now \$4,800. It is going to go to \$6,700 per beneficiary in the seventh year. Only in this city and where the virus has spread in other parts of the country, when you spend more money like this do people call it a cut. It is not a cut. We are slowing the growth.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats clearly have not understood that, in fact, in reality, we did abolish baseline budgeting, and so they are using the same language that they used before, but I think it is very helpful to actually take apart their argument, facet by facet, piece by piece, because it starts with a \$270 billion cut, which is completely false. That is simply untrue. We are going from \$4,800 per beneficiary per year in 1995 to \$6,700 per beneficiary per year in 2002. How that can possibly be a cut under anybody's rubric, under anybody's language, other than for the purpose of trying to manipulate public opinion or trying to score political points, or simply to prevaricate and falsify the record, is beyond me.

You start with that, you start with a \$270 billion cut which is not a cut, that is incorrect, and I think then we also have to talk about where is the responsibility? Why do we have any responsibility to deal with Medicare? If the program, if it is so great and it is working perfectly, why should we touch it? What are we trying to do? I think we ought to talk about that, maybe.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, this is an important thing. I

do not think the American people have to take the Republicans' word for it on Medicare. Again, we can go back and look what the Washington Post, which has long been a traditional ally of liberal Members of Congress up here, first of all, the Post came out a few weeks ago saying that the Democrats were really playing demagoguery with Medicare. Then they came out and said straight out that there is not a relationship between the tax cuts and the Medicare savings. Again, they said that the Democrats were, again, playing games with this.

I think what has happened with some members of the Democratic Party, and what they have done has just been absolutely shameless. We have had Members stand up here kicking and screaming, showing pictures of grandparents, saying, "The mean-spirited Republicans are going to take away their Medicare; is it not the worst thing that has happened? The locusts are going to descend from the heavens. They are going to be kicked out on the streets."

The fact of the matter is that a lot of those liberal Members who are pointing at those grandparents, saying they want to help them, are not telling the truth to them, which is again the trustees say it is going bankrupt in 7 years. Who is being more benevolent toward seniors, those who admit there is a problem, who want to go in and give seniors the flexibility they need to decide how they are going to handle their health care plan, instead of a bureaucrat in Washington, or the person who says there is absolutely nothing wrong with this system? Again, it is double-talk, it is demagoguery, and I think it is absolutely shameless.

Mr. HOKE. As the Washington Post says, it is Medigogery. I would like to make a prediction. I think this may help some people put this in context and perspective, because it is do brutally partisan here. It is very unfortunate, because so much of what you hear is put in this partisan context.

I predict when it comes down to the voting on Medicare and on the reforms that we are putting in place, and we ought to talk about some of the choices that seniors are going to have, because I think it is very important, but my prediction is that you will see 30 or 40 members of the Democratic party proudly casting aye votes in favor of the reforms that we bring to the floor.

□ 1745

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Many now are admitting in the press that there are not going to be cuts. Senator MOYNIHAN has said there are no cuts in Medicare. We have had Members in this House come forward and say that the Democrats need to admit that the Medicare plan is not as draconian as they originally said it was, that this is a plan that works.

If we look at the PSN's, provider service networks, where we are allowing, again, free market-driven solutions, if we look at the HMO's, if we

look at the medical savings account, this is a revolutionary plan. I mean, we are giving the seniors 31 years of revolution in the health care field in one act.

I have to tell my colleagues something. I will tell any senior citizen that I am proud to be a part of this process. This is an historical time.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Exactly. If I could just reclaim my time briefly, I hate to question the motives of anyone, but sometimes I wonder. The reason that we have heard the harsh rhetoric that we have had for the last 3 or 4 months is not I think that some people fear that this reform plan is going to fail, I think they are afraid it is going to work, and that seniors are going to like it. The reason that they know it is going to work is because a lot of things that we are talking about in terms of reform are currently working in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, we are not reinventing the wheel here. Managed care and PPO's and HMO's and medical savings accounts are currently working. We saw a report on the news the other night, I think it was NBC, who talked about where some of these programs are actually being implemented, seniors love them.

At my town meetings where we have had seniors who are already members of what is called Senior Gold out in the State of Minnesota that is sponsored by BlueCross BlueShield, they love it. I mean, where these things are actually happening, it has become very popular. I think sometimes it is not the fear that this will fail, I think it is the fear that this will succeed and that somehow, we will get the credit.

Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite Founding Fathers was John Adams, and this is one of my favorite quotes. He said, "Facts are stubborn things." We can ignore the facts and we can deny the facts, but in the end facts are facts, and the facts are that the Medicare system as it exists today is headed for bankruptcy. Another fact is we are going to be spending more money on the system in 7 years than we are spending today. Another fact is that if seniors want to stay right where they are, they can.

Mr. HOKE. May I interrupt you for a moment, because what we are calling this program is Medicare Plus, and the reason we call it Medicare Plus is that you start with Medicare, which is exactly as it is today, and then we are going to have three or four other choices that senior citizens are going to be given.

I see that we have one of our newest Members of the Republican Conference here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think he is the newest.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] want to say a word?

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I sure do. I joined this revolution in full uniform and armor just a couple of months ago,

but there were many conservative Democrats, as you know, that helped to make the contract a reality in this House, and in this House, and in this House in the first 100 days.

One of the reasons I think that it was such a successful 100 days, as the gentleman already pointed out, is the incredible zeal, the incredible talent of the new Members who arrived here, the new Republican freshman class, dedicated to one thing more than anything else, and that is to change the way this place works and to find solutions to American problems, rather than just to play party games all day.

I have been delighted now to have the chance to work with the new Republican majority for the last several weeks since our August break, and I have been delighted with the temper, with the incredible energy and the organization that I see still burning bright within the party to get this revolution completed.

Mr. Speaker, we have only just begun. If we cannot end this session with the real dedication of balancing the budget the way the freshmen came up here so dedicated to do, to saving Medicare from bankruptcy, and to ending welfare as we know it in America, and to building an American system of government where the government is our servant again instead of our master, then shame on us.

We have such an opportunity this year. This debate we will be entering into in the next several weeks over how to redefine the systems of health care in America is one of the key ingredients.

Now, the President himself has admitted that the Medicare system in America is ready to go bankrupt in 7 years unless we do something dramatic and immediate. The President, as the Governor of Arkansas, pleaded with the Federal Government for many years to change the system of Medicaid to make it one that worked for needy people instead of one that wasted money on mandates that just cost money, just made people work, just created an invitation to fraud and abuse. The Governor Clinton pleaded with us to do exactly what we are now recommending we do in Medicaid reform.

During the next several months, as we complete this journey toward a balanced budget, as we debate these critical questions of Medicaid and Medicare reform, and end the system of dependency on welfare in America as we have come to know it as a way of life instead of a stopping off place on the road of life, as we enter into this several months of debate, this will be our finest hour and our severest test as a party and as a people.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to come down today when I heard my colleagues talking, and I wanted to congratulate my colleagues and to urge that we never lose this fire. I am delighted to be a part of it and anxious to see us move on to the final victories.

Mr. SHAYS. I would love to just weigh in and just thank the gentleman

for being such a catalyst when he was on the side I am on right now, and now as a new Republican, because you have been a force for many years in the very things that we have been working on. It just really is extraordinary to have the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] as part of our family, and to say to the gentleman that we have such an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I get up every morning and I just count my blessings for the opportunity to be a part of a Congress that is bringing about extraordinary change. There are people on this side of the aisle as well that have weighed in and have added their part, a lot of good people on this side of the aisle.

The gentleman mentioned that he believes that there are a number of Democrats who will vote ultimately for the Medicare plan. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know why I think so? First off, the plan that some on the democratic side have described is a plan that does not exist.

I had community meetings the last two weekends and I met some real hostility. People said, you are going to increase the copayments, you are going to have copayments. I said, no. They said, but you are going to have increased deductions for hospitals and doctors. I said, no. They said, well, you are going to increase the premium, and I said, no, the premium is going to stay at 31.5 percent, and it is going to stay at that percent, and the Federal Government's taxpayers are going to pay 68.5 percent. Then they said, oh, you are going to push everybody out of fee-for-service, our Medicare system as we know it. That is simply not true. That is another no; they can stay in that plan, but if they want, they can go to all the kinds of plans the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] mentioned, and he mentioned three, but candidly, there are an unlimited number.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain kinds of programs, but you can have providers that come in and say, if you want a certain kind of eyeglass care or dental care or drugs, they can encourage you to leave that traditional fee-for-service.

What is so darned exciting, and the Democrats have simply not yet caught on to what is so exciting, that we are saving this plan and we are making it better.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut is absolutely right. It amazed me, that during 1 minutes this morning the gentlewoman from Connecticut specifically said, they want to know what our plan is, I will tell you what our plan is. Our plan is Medicare as it is today right now. That is our plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Plus.

Mr. HOKE. This was the gentlewoman from Connecticut, not our gentlewoman from Connecticut, the other gentlewoman from Connecticut during 1 minutes, and she was saying, very seriously, that they want to know what our plan is, the Democrat plan is, our plan is exactly what exists today.

Mr. Speaker, that is what is such a shame, because if you are a senior citizen and we actually enact this piece of legislation to reform Medicare and save it and improve it and simplify it, which I believe we will, then as a senior citizen you will be given the option of having Medicare as we know it today, if that is what you want, or Plus, and also, three large categories. As the gentleman pointed out quite correctly, there are an infinite number of options within those three large categories that are in addition to what exists today now.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the neatest parts about our plan is that if any citizen is unhappy with the plan they chose, they can move back.

Mr. HOKE. Just like a private citizen, just like you and I, just like somebody in the private sector. You are not going to be stuck in a 1965 plan and not have any other options or places to go.

Mr. SHAYS. However, I think the gentleman was making another point. Americans have 2 years, and during those 2 years they can go into the private plan, the Medicare Plus plan, but if you decide you do not like it, it was not what you expected, you can come right back into what exists now.

Mr. TAUZIN. Even after that 2-year period, senior citizens sign up for a year at a time, so that you choose your plan for the next year. Within that first 2-year period, you can try them all. You can see which one really meets the needs of your circumstances and which one really provides you the best medical care. You may find one where, for example, you find that your drugs are covered. You may find a plan that is better in fact because it includes some dental care that was not available in another plan you were in.

The short and sum of it is you can choose as a senior citizen when today you cannot. You have one choice only and the choice you have, the status quo, is about to go bankrupt. What kind of a choice is that?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That is what is so shameful about people getting up here and saying, we have a plan, and our plan is to keep Medicare the way it is. I will tell you, there is a correlation between our Medicare plan and what happened there, and also what happened with the Contract With America.

As the gentleman mentioned, some in the Democratic party came on board with us. So I think that the votes in the first 100 days, I believe about 310 Members joined together, Republicans and Democrats alike, to pass that.

The same thing is going to happen on Medicare, because I will tell my colleagues, the gentlewoman that stood up from Connecticut this morning and said, we want to keep the Medicare status quo, we want to keep it the way it is now, we want to forget about the reforms, we want to forget about the fact that Medicare is going bankrupt in 7 years according to the Medicare trustees, is making former Governor Mario Cuomo's point for him exactly. He said

on a radio talk show, the Democratic party is out of power because basically we put our head in the sands for too long; we are living in the past, we have offered no solutions.

For somebody to stand up here on the floor and with a straight face tell the senior citizens, which the gentlewoman from Connecticut was doing, that we can keep going on the same fail path that we have followed for the past few years, with the rate of growth going the way it is without any changes or any reforms whatsoever, we can keep doing it that way, is shameful. The gentlewoman from Connecticut knows, the President of the United States knows, every Member on the Democratic side of the aisle knows, that if we do that, we are selling senior citizens down the river, and it is shameful. I have a 92-year-old grandmother that I am not willing to sell down the river for political gain.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to make a couple of quick points. I think what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] just said is important. Many of the Members of our freshman class are baby boomers, and I think we do come here with a special responsibility. Both of my parents are on Medicare, and we have a special responsibility to our kids.

I want to come back to something that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] made, and I think it is the heart and soul of what really is the philosophical debate, and it is the crossroads that we stand at here in the United States today. The debate about Medicare and the debate about Medicaid is really a debate between those people who fundamentally believe in Government control, and in Government decisions, and in Government bureaucracy, and between those who want to give people choices and options, who believe in freedom and in markets.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that if we get more freedom, if we get more market working out there, if we get real market forces controlling this thing, we can absolutely control the cost. It is happening in the private sector. The average cost of health care increases over the last 18 months in the private sector has been something like 1.1 percent. On the government side, when you are talking about Medicare or Medicaid, it has been over 10 percent. We believe this system is going to work, and my sense is, some people on the other side fear it is going to work.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question? I want to ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] a question, because I know that the Speaker has been following this very closely, and I know that he is very curious himself about how it is possible that we are going to go from a situation where right now we will not only offer everyone Medicare as it is today, but we will also offer a series of other choices, and yet, this is going to save money.

Now, the Speaker, listening to this, might think that there is a disconnect somewhere and it might be confusing to him to understand exactly how it is possible that we are going to actually save money doing this, and obviously I am asking for rhetorical reasons. I think it would be very helpful to spell out exactly why it is that by getting the private sector much more aggressively involved in this, we are going to squeeze the fat out.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of factors here. First, let me say when we said how are we going to save Medicare, we have four basic choices. We can increase taxes, and that is the payroll tax of 1.45 percent, and if you are self-employed, it is 2.9 percent. That is a no. We can affect the beneficiaries, we can affect the providers, or we can change the system. We are looking to change the system and allow choice and still allow people to keep the same plan if they want.

Now, how is the private sector going to step in? Well, all you need to do is just think about how the Government is running things.

□ 1800

The FAA, for instance, knew 10 years ago that we were going to have double the increase in traffic. Yet the FAA has not planned for that. So what do we have right now? We have a system that is basically shutting down. But that is the Government running it.

Medicare and Medicaid cannot tell you what hospitals have sent money, even a year later. They do not even know why it sent money. If we want to come back and find, out, they have to reconstruct it. But Home Depot can tell you at 9:30 in the morning what they sold the 2 hours before and they have already ordered—

Mr. HOKE. At every single store in the country.

Mr. SHAYS. Every single store in the country. And they have it centrally located.

The Federal Government does not do a great job of controlling costs, but it also does a terrible job in getting at waste, fraud, and abuse.

I had a hearing on waste, fraud, and abuse. The estimate was between 10 and 20 percent. Not 10. Ten is the low end of waste, fraud, and abuse. It really goes up to 20 percent.

I would love to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], an expert in this area, and tell you that we have got lots of opportunity here.

Mr. TAUZIN. We have just handled the Medicaid reforms out of the Committee on Commerce. We are going to take up the Medicare reforms on Monday. We will begin the debate. But let me tell you what the real option is, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has pointed it out.

The option is either fix this system, control costs, and create a better choice for Americans or else raise taxes dramatically to keep this system from bankruptcy.

Mr. SHAYS. And that is not going to happen.

Mr. TAUZIN. The status quo the gentleman from Connecticut was defending relies upon us deciding one day to raise taxes dramatically. That is the status quo they are defending. Liberal Democrats have no problem with that. I think most Americans do.

To raise the payroll tax sufficient to keep this system out of bankruptcy, we are told, will require a doubling of the payroll tax payments of working Americans by the year 2040. That is how immense the problem is if we do not cure it today. That is their solution.

You try to explain that to working Americans who can barely get by on the paycheck today, we are going to double their payroll taxes. That is not going to work. What will work is a system of choice and reform in the Medicare system so that seniors can take advantage of what you and I can take advantage of today, choosing plans that work better for us in a system where cost does count and people are interested in efficiencies and better treatment.

I saw an NBC program that centered on a program in Arizona where citizens have the choice there to go to HMO's. They showed some senior citizens telling their story, about how much better care they were getting and how much better treatment they were getting and how much better their lives were under an HMO. They showed New Jersey where Medisave accounts were being used and how citizens there were saying how much it saved them money and really improved their health care system.

Those are just two of the options our Medicare proposal will allow seniors in America.

Mr. HOKE. Is the real key to this not choice, giving our senior citizens the choices that we have in the Government, that people in the private sector have got?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It goes deeper than that. It is not just choice. It is about markets and it is about competition.

We saw this, and part of the reason the Soviet Union ultimately collapsed, and the Wall Street Journal ran such a beautiful editorial shortly after that. I think the headline was "Markets Are More Powerful Than Armies."

What we saw on the other side of the world was that if you have a monopolistic system where the Government controls, you have enormous inefficiencies.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] talked about the FAA. They are the largest buyer of vacuum tubes in the world.

Mr. SHAYS. Vacuum tubes? Do they still make vacuum tubes?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Not in the United States. We have to buy them from Czechoslovakia.

You have probably seen the Speaker carries around one of those vacuum tubes that the FAA buys.

Mr. SHAYS. I am flying home tonight. You are telling me it is vacuum tubes?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am telling you this technology was developed in 1955. That is what you are going to fly home on. The telephone companies route millions of calls using computers, and they do it without even thinking about it. Yet we are using vacuum tubes. The Speaker carries one around.

That is the difference between a Government-controlled system and a market system. Competition makes them fund efficiencies. We can find those efficiencies if we allow markets to work.

Mr. TAUZIN. If I can, I want to go back, cross over from Medicare to Medicaid again.

I want to remind you all that something happens when you get to Washington that changes you somehow. I hope the freshmen really have a great success in changing the way this place works.

When Bill Clinton was Governor of Arkansas, he understood that government mandates, government command, control, all these strings we tie to these programs simply create inefficiencies, paperwork, fraud, abuse, and all kinds of things. He begged the Congress for several years, "Please get rid of those mandates, send us the money in a block grant, let us run our program in the State of Arkansas, we'll all be better off."

Guess what we are proposing? We are proposing to do exactly that, to send Medicaid moneys at a 4.9-percent growth rate per year for 7 years. We are planning on sending that to the States just as Bill Clinton pled with us to do, without all the strings, with the simple requirement that the plans they submit to carry it out have the same protections for seniors and for poor people that the current Medicaid system does.

So what are we doing? We are proposing to do what Bill Clinton wanted to do as Governor. Why on Earth is he opposing it as a President now? Did something happen? Did he drink some water here in the Potomac that changed his mind? I do not know, I do know this. For people to believe that there is a monopoly on caring hearts and intelligent minds in Washington bureaucrats and there are no people at home with caring hearts and intelligent minds, capable of better running these programs is to believe something I have not heard in my district and my State in a long time.

The truth is if we do what Bill Clinton wanted as Governor and create these programs with incentives and lack of mandates for people at home to deliver these services the way folks at home know how to deliver them, we are going to be in much better shape. And if we recreate Medicare so that seniors have the kinds of real choices that most other Americans have, they will have better care.

If they do not like the new plan, they can stay in the Medicare system as it

is. We will make sure it is well-funded. But if they want to go to something better, they will have that choice just like other citizens. Is that not the kindest thing we can do to folks we love who are senior citizens today?

Mr. SHAYS. That is well said.

I was thinking as we were talking, making reference to people on the other side of the aisle, candidly that is not usually my way of feeling comfortable because there are a lot of good people on this side of the aisle who have made a contribution.

I think part of it is the frustration of here we have a plan that we think is so good and we are willing to debate it on the ideas. In other words, if you do not think there should be the private sector, if you do not think people should have choice or you do not like the kinds of choices, debate it on that. But do not tell my constituents that there is going to be a co-payment, that there is going to be a deduction. Do not go into nursing homes and tell everybody that they are not going to be able to live here next year.

It brings out a side of you that you would just as soon not get into. I just want to make this point to you. One of the constructive arguments that people on this side of the aisle were making was, hey, we should see this bill, it should have the light of day and so on. We had a conversation with our Speaker and he totally agreed. Ideas win. We have every reason to be proud of this plan.

So this plan has come out in full detail today, the legislation. It will be introduced to the committee but not voted on next week, in Commerce, I believe. Members will be free not to be here. They can study it every day. This bill will be debated on in committee and Democrats who have ideas to improve this plan, not just criticize it but to improve it, will make a wonderful contribution, because we are listening. If we can make this plan better, we are going to do it.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think you have highlighted something very important. It really was not, I do not think, our leadership that tried to turn this into a partisan issue.

I think everyone would be happier, I know the senior citizens of the United States would be far happier if we could debate this more rationally rather than some of the harsh rhetoric that we have heard. It has been turned into a partisan issue. I think that is incredibly unfortunate particularly for the senior citizens because sometimes they wonder what really should they believe. That is why I made the point earlier about the facts are stubborn things. If they would just look at and study the facts, look at the options they are going to have, I think we could solve this problem, and it would be far better if it were on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. TAUZIN. Let me just point out that we do not need fistfights in the hall, and shouting matches in the hall.

American seniors do not need to be scared to death about this stuff. We need to debate it as adults. They would like to see us have that open debate as adults, trying to find rational solutions to a system about to go bankrupt. The last thing we need to see ever again is another picture of people shouting at each other in the hall. This is not a partisan issue. This is about mothers and fathers and grandfathers and grandmothers and about the working Americans who try desperately to try to earn a payroll enough to support them in their senior years.

This is a good debate for us to have and we ought to have it as adults. Americans want to see that. They want to see us start acting like Americans once in a while who want to save this country instead of as partisans fighting in the hallway.

Mr. SHAYS. I think they saw that in the vote on the temporary continuing resolution. The Government would have stopped being funded at the end of this month. What is that, tomorrow? In fact, we were able to get together and extend on a temporary basis at 90 to 95 percent of funding so we are not adding new money, we are putting in less money into the plan, giving ourselves 6 more weeks to have a dialog among Republicans and Democrats. We have a debt ceiling question. I am not voting to increase the debt ceiling, but I am going to vote for increasing the debt ceiling when this President weights in on a 7-year budget, then the President decides with us where we make our changes in programs, where we cut, where we slow the growth, we participated on a bipartisan basis.

But we are going to get that budget balanced in 7 years, we are going to save Medicare, and we are also going to transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society. We are going to do that, and I think we can do it on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. TAUZIN. For those who complain that this has not been an open process, let me assure you, I have never seen a more open Congress than this one. We have had more bills come in under an open rule, more discussion on this floor than I have ever seen in all my career here.

I do not know if you know it, but in the last three Congresses there were seven hearings on Medicaid. In this Congress we have already had seven hearings on Medicaid, as many hearings as three Congresses combined. We need to debate this in the light of day indeed, and we are doing that, and I have never seen more open discussion in all my years. This is a subject every senior has a great interest in, every working American, and we all ought to share in that debate again as we have proposed in the end. We will come up with some answers for America, not just for one party or the other.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to also interject that the whole issue of Medicare, people who think that we

have not had enough public hearings or discussions, in my own case I have had 33 town meetings. At every one of those town meetings we have talked about Medicare and some of the ideas we are considering. So I do not think anyone is going to be surprised when they read some of the details that are going to be in this plan because we have had something like 36 hearings on the issue, of various committees on the issue of Medicare.

This is not something we are going to sneak up on the American people, particularly on the senior citizens. I think by the time this bill is signed by the President, I think everybody in the United States will have a very thorough understanding of what we are talking about and frankly I think it will enjoy widespread public support as well.

Mr. HOKE. The reality is, and I think it is good to hear this from different perspectives. The reality is that there is actually a schism within the Democratic Party, as well, as to how to use or how to deal with this issue.

Some people believe it ought to be used strictly for political purposes, and that is a voice that we hear a great deal more of on the floor. There are an awful lot of others who also believe that it ought to be dealt with in a responsible way and those are the voices that are being heard in committee and that are really working on the problem. I suppose it is a reflection of politics, but it is absolutely true and unfortunate in this situation that it is easy, at least it is perceived to be something that is easy to scare seniors with and to scare them into believing that somehow they will not be able to have the same kind of quality care that they deserve and expect and must have.

It is pretty clear, I hope it is clear at least that our commitment is to preserving, to protecting, to improving and finally frankly to simplifying this system so that it becomes easier for seniors to use and it brings them into the 1990's as well, and to join the rest of the country.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We have one of our fellow freshmen, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], joining us. I would like to offer to yield to him for a few moments.

Mr. BILBRAY. I think one of the sad things about this Medicare tactic is that the people that are trying to pull this off, the old establishment in Washington that cannot cope with the fact that it is time to move upward and onward to improve on the past and not allow the old systems to just collapse after 37 years. But I think what they really miss here with the Medicare is that as the seniors find out about this problem, as they are being educated about this problem, their credibility and the credibility of the Washington establishment is slowly but surely crumbling more and more with this big lie that is going out there.

I have advertisements running in my district attacking me on certain posi-

tions and they have not even taken the decency to check my vote. My colleague from Louisiana knows, because he serves on the Committee on Commerce with me that are working on this bill that the facts that we know and the facts that we are explaining to our seniors are nothing like the big lies that the Medicare advertisements are saying out there. That, they really feel, will win them points. The seniors know what is going on. They are very sophisticated.

I am getting 80 percent of my calls coming in saying, "We don't believe these Medicare tactics, keep going." I hope that the colleagues who are on the other side of the aisle who think that Medicare will benefit them, it is destroying what little credibility that this town has left.

□ 1815

We need to shoot straight and be up front with the public, and I think this is a classic example where they are saying what sounds good right now to scare people, and the more people are learning, the more they are saying it is the same old garbage from Washington, "They are trying to manipulate us and scare us so they can maintain their power base they have always had."

And at what cost? I mean, how many of us as a consumer would accept a product being sold to us three times more expensive every year than the rate of inflation?

I do not care even if the system was not crashing, as the President's trustees say, if we could not manage a program, and I say this as someone who managed local government for 20 years, if we cannot manage a program with the cost increasing twice the rate of inflation, if the Democrats and Republicans cannot manage a health care program twice the rate of inflation, then none of us should be here. We should all go home and let the seniors run it.

Mr. SHAYS. I have waited 20 years for the opportunity we have. I was a State legislator. I saw the Congress deficit spend. I served here 8 years. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] has been here much longer. We have an incredible opportunity to get our financial house in order, balance the budget, save Medicare and some of our other trust funds and change our corporate and social welfare state into an opportunity for society. This chance is here. It can happen on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank everyone for participating. We are making huge differences. It started with the Shays act on the first night. We are going to balance the budget, we are going to save Medicare. We are going to change welfare as we know it. We are going to keep a lot of the promises, actually, the President made when he was campaigning last time.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1995, TO FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 104

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, September 29, 1995, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Friday, October 6, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day beginning with Friday, September 29, 1995, through Friday, October 6, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, October 10, 1995, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR LEGISLATIVE DAY OF FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the legislative day of Friday, September 29, 1995, all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extension of Remarks".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, October 10, 1995, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make ap-

pointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, October 6, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 1995, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, October 10, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 8 a.m. on Wednesday, October 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES AT ANY TIME ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses at any time on Wednesday, October 11, 1995, for the purpose of a joint meeting to commemorate the 50th anniversary of World War II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, October 11, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

SCHEDULING OF VOTES ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1995, AND WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1995

(Mr. SHAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader has stated Members should not expect any recorded votes until Wednesday, October 11. Any votes ordered on Tuesday, October 10, will be postponed until Wednesday, October 11.

DESIGNATION OF HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH OCTOBER 10, 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 29, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable CONSTANCE A. MORELLA to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through October 10, 1995.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is appointed as an additional conferee on the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1925

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EVERETT] at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

H.R. 2404. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until November 1, 1995, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FROST (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. TEJEDA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), after 3 p.m., Thursday, September 28, and for the balance of the week, on account of family business.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of attending a funeral in Chicago.

Mr. WALKER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of attending the official closure ceremony of the Plattsburgh Air Force Base in Plattsburgh, NY.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PASTOR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLEARY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILLEARY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TATE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 144. An act to amend section 526 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize awards of attorney's fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 531. An act to authorize a circuit judge who has taken part in an en banc hearing of a case to continue to participate in that case after taking senior status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 977. An act to correct certain references in the Bankruptcy Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1147. An act to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Finance.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2399. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the intent of such Act and to reduce burdensome regulatory requirements on creditors; and

H.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 104, 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Friday, October 6, 1995.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 104, the House adjourned until Friday, October 6, 1995, at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,

Washington, DC, September 22, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 304(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. §1384(b)), I am transmitting on behalf of the Board of Directors the enclosed notice of proposed rulemaking for publication in the Congressional Record. The notice contains the recommendation of the Executive Director which the Board has approved regarding the Employee Polygraph

Protection Act of 1988 and its applicability to the Capitol Police under the Congressional Accountability Act. The Congressional Accountability Act specifies that the enclosed notice be published on the first day on which both Houses are in session following this transmittal.

Sincerely,

GLEN D. NAGER,
Chair of the Board.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995: Extension of Rights and Protections Under the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Summary: This document contains proposed regulations authorizing the Capitol Police to use lie detector tests under Section 204(a)(3) and (c) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA"), P.L. 104-1. The proposed regulations set forth the recommendations of the Executive Director, Office of Compliance as approved by the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance.

The CAA applies the rights and protections of eleven federal labor and employment law statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch. Section 204 extends the rights and protections of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 [29 U.S.C. §§2201, et seq.] to covered employees and employing offices. The provisions of section 204 are effective January 23, 1996, one year after the effective date of the CAA.

The purpose of this proposed regulation is to authorize the Capitol Police to use lie detector tests with respect to its own employees.

Dates: Comments are due on or before 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Congressional Record.

Addresses: Submit written comments (an original and 10 copies) to the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive notification of receipt of comments are requested to include a self-addressed, stamped post card. Comments may also be transmitted by facsimile ("FAX") machine to (202) 252-3115. This is not a toll-free call. Copies of comments submitted by the public will be available for review at the Law Library Reading Room, Room LM-201, Law Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, Washington, D.C., Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

For Further Information Contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance at (202) 252-3100. This notice is also available in the following formats: large print, braille, audio tape, and electronic file on computer disk. Requests for this notice in an alternative format should be made to Mr. Russell Jackson, Director, Service Department, Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, (202) 244-2705.

Supplementary Information:

Background and Summary

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA") was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. In general, the CAA applies the rights and protections of eleven federal labor and employment law statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch. Section 204(a) and (b) of the CAA applies the rights and protections of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, 29 U.S.C. §2001, et seq. ("EPPA") to covered employees and employing offices. Section 204(c) authorizes the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("Board") established under the CAA to issue regulations

implementing the section. Section 204(c) further states that such regulations "shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsections (a) and (b) except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." Section 204(a)(3) provides that nothing in this section shall preclude the Capitol Police from using lie detector tests in accordance with regulations issued under section 204(c) of the CAA.

The Capitol Police is the primary law enforcement agency of the legislative branch. The proposed regulations would provide the Capitol Police with specific authorization to use lie detector tests. The limitations on the exclusion of the proposed regulation are derived from the Secretary of Labor's regulation implementing the exclusion for public sector employers under Section 7(a) of the EPPA (29 C.F.R. §801.10(d)), which limits the exclusion to the entity's own employees.

The Board issues concurrently with this proposed regulation a separate Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which invites comment regarding a number of other regulatory issues, including what regulations, if any, the Board should issue to implement the remainder of Section 204.

Proposed Regulation

Exclusion for employees of the Capitol Police. None of the limitations on the use of lie detector tests by employing offices set forth in Section 204 of the CAA apply to the Capitol Police. This exclusion from the limitations of Section 204 of the CAA applies only with respect to Capitol Police employees. Except as otherwise provided by law or these regulations, this exclusion does not extend to contractors or nongovernmental agents of the Capitol Police, nor does it extend to the Capitol Police with respect to employees of a private employer or an otherwise covered employing office with which the Capitol Police has a contractual or other business relationship.

Recommended Method of Approval

The Board recommends that this regulation be approved by concurrent resolution in light of the nature of the work performed by the Capitol Police and the fact that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate has exclusive responsibility for the Capitol Police.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on this 27th day of September, 1995.

GLEN D. NAGER,
Chair of the Board,
Office of Compliance.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1477. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's annual report on the low-income housing and community development activities of the Federal Home Loan Bank System for 1994, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1430(j)(12)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1478. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's report to Congress on flood insurance compliance by insured credit unions, pursuant to section 529(e)(2) of the

Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1479. A letter from the Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000e-4(e); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1480. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Financial Review of the District of Columbia's Drug Asset Forfeiture Program," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1481. A letter from the Chair of the Board, Office of Compliance, transmitting notice of proposed rulemaking for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pursuant to Public Law 104-1, section 304(b)(1) (109 Stat. 29); to the Committee on House Oversight.

1482. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Federal Field Work Group [FFWG] Report to Congress on Alaska Rural Sanitation"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1815. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-237 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. QUILLEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2405) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-270). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 235. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-271). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2259. A bill to disapprove certain sentencing guideline amendments (Rept. 104-272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker.

H.R. 1816. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. BILILEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MCCREERY):

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve and reform the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. TALENT):

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of door hinges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the participation of the public in governmental decisions regarding the location of group homes established pursuant to the program of block grants for the prevention and treatment of substance abuse; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. DANNER:

H.R. 2428. A bill to encourage the donation of food and grocery products to nonprofit organizations for distribution to needy individuals by giving the Model Good Samaritan Food Donation Act the full force and effect of law; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Farms for the Future Act of 1990 to provide agricultural producers, in cooperation with States and local governments, financially competitive options for maintaining farmland in agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut:

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require that candidates for the House of Representatives receive at least half of their campaign contributions for individuals; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit loans from individual retirement plans for certain first-time homebuyer, education, and medical emergency expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require State unemployment insurance laws to establish a system under which workers may purchase insurance to cover the costs of health insurance during periods of unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the commercial transportation of horses for slaughter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for lobbying expenses in connection with State legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. COX, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOX, Mr. FUNDERBURK,

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. JOFGREN, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WARD, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals to 100 percent of such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2436. A bill to provide for adjustment of immigration status for certain Polish and Hungarian parolees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 2437. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands in Gilpin County, CO; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 2438. A bill to provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Gunnison County, CO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2439. A bill to facilitate the establishment of State infrastructure banks to finance certain transportation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MINGE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 2440. A bill to amend the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify certain notice requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to adapt the copyright law to the digital, networked environment of the national information infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTOR:

H.R. 2442. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration project to provide covered beneficiaries under the military health care system with the option to enroll in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAXON (for himself, Mr. FRISA, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KING, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WALSH, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 2444. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. EWING, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 2445. A bill to require Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to focus on price stability in establishing monetary policy to ensure the stable, long-term purchasing power of the currency, to repeal the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the influence of multicandidate political committees in elections for Federal office; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. TORKILDSEN (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HORN, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit nonparty multicandidate political committees from making contributions to candidates in congressional elections; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2448. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for the construction of the Great Lakes International Air Cargo Superport at Youngstown Warren Regional Airport in Vienna, OH; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 2449. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide funding for air cargo jetports; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to place the burden of proof on the Secretary of the Treasury in civil cases and on the taxpayer in administrative proceedings, to require 30 days notice and judicial consent before lien or seizure, to increase the limit on recovery of civil damages for unauthorized collection actions and exclude such damages from income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Ms. DUNN of Washington):

H.R. 2451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that meals provided at remote fish processing facilities shall be exempt from the limitation on the deduction for meals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON (for himself, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.J. Res. 110. Joint Resolution providing for the appointment of Howard H. Baker, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Anne D'Harnoncourt as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Louis Gerstner as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BARCIA of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that States should work more aggressively to attack the problem of violent crimes committed by repeat offenders and criminals serving abbreviated sentences; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 103: Mr. PETRI and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 303: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 449: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 580: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 835: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 868: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 911: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 974: Mr. CRAMER and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 989: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1023: Mr. HORN and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1073: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1074: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1114: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1124: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1127: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. FOX, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1161: Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 1235: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1241: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1274: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 1366: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 1381: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1386: Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 1406: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1416: Mr. FAZIO of California and Mr. WARD.

H.R. 1490: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1500: Mr. FORD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SABO, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1504: Mr. LAUGHLIN and Mr. BRYANT of Texas.

H.R. 1512: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1514: Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JONES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1619: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1649: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 1661: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 1733: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1744: Mr. HOKE and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1777: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1780: Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 1806: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1810: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1818: Mr. BAESLER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1856: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 1928: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1933: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1982: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2009: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. FOGLETTA.
H.R. 2047: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
H.R. 2072: Mr. LARGENT.
H.R. 2086: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2090: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 2098: Mr. BASS and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 2130: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 2153: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 2158: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2178: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 2190: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2195: Mr. BLUTE.
H.R. 2205: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. OLIVER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 2240: Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2326: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2337: Mr. SPRATT.
H.R. 2341: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 2342: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. CHAPMAN.
H.R. 2411: Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.J. Res. 89: Mr. ZIMMER.
H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. HORN and Mr. DELUMS.

H.R. 390: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 534: Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 789: Mr. TORRICELLI.
H.R. 1289: Ms. WOOLSEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

43. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Travelers Protection Association of America, relative to urging the Congress of the United States to continue to defer the proposed airline fuel tax until the airline industry becomes financially stable; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 359: Mr. NADLER.